DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 208 HE 019 624

AUTHOR	Petry, John Richard
TITLE	A Study of Selected Administrative Problems of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937-1945.
PUB DATE	[86]
NOTE	346p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; *College Administration; *College Faculty; *College Programs; Economic Climate; Educational Finance; *Educational History; *Financial Problems; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; Political Influences; Problem Solving
IDENTIFIERS	*George Peabody College for Teachers TN

ABSTRACT

Problems concerning finance, faculty, and educational programs faced by George Peabody College for Teachers during 1937-1945 are examined, along with the solutions. Attention is directed to: circumstances surrounding problem identification, the background of each problem, who had responsibility for formulating each solution, other individuals/groups who provided consultation, data utilized in arriving at solutions, the rationale for solutions, how successfully the solutions were implemented, and problems that remained unsolved. Despite financial depression and war, the administration preserved the image of Peabody as a college for teachers whose primary mission was to improve educational opportunities throughout the Southeast. Major financial problems were related to income, salaries, inadequate business procedures, and inadequately maintained buildings and grounds. The quality of faculty and the relationship of the faculty to the educational program were additional problems. Problems relating to the educational program included enrollment, instructional reorganization, and academic performance at the college. Appendices include: a list of administrators and trustees during 1937-1945, a bibliography, statements of income for each of the 9 years, and general education board grants to the college, 1909-1945. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273208

A STUDY OF SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS OF GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, 1937-1945

by

John Richard Petry

HE019624

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John R. Petry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study
Limitations of the Study
Justifications of the Study
Related Studies
Sources of the Data
Limitations of the Data
Organization of the Data

II. PROBLEMS RELATED TO FINANCE 22

The Financial Status of the College
  Income
  Expenditures
  Indebtedness
  Endowment and Assets
Financial Problems and Their Solutions
  Income
  Salaries
  Business Office Procedures
  Buildings and Grounds

III. PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE FACULTY 83

A Profile of the Faculty
  Highest Earned Degree
  Professional Rank
  Visibility
  Non-Instructional Responsibilities
Faculty Problems and Their Solutions
  Developing Teaching Personnel
  Relationship of the Faculty to the Educational Program

Chapter Page

IV. PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM 125

The Educational Program of the College
Purposes
Educational Services
Academic Divisions
Course Offerings
Degrees Granted
Problems and Solutions Related to the Educational Program
Enrollment
Instructional Reorganization
Academic Performance

V. CONCLUSION 229

Findings and Conclusions
Implications
Recommendations
Suggestions for Further Studies

BIBLIOGRAPHY 268

APPENDIX 277

Appendix A: Officers of the Administration, 1937-1945
Appendix B: Identification List
Appendix C: Interview Letters
Appendix D: Studies about Peabody not Related to This Study
Appendix E: List of Trustees, 1937-1945
Appendix F: Statement of Income, 1937-1945
Appendix G: Statement of Expense, 1937-1945
Appendix H: General Education Board Grants to George Peabody College for Teachers, 1909-1945

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Relationship of Income and Expenditures, 1937-1945 32

2. Increase in Endowment Value, 1937-1945 34

3. Increase in Assets, 1937-1945 35

4. Endowment Income, 1937-1945 37

5. Major Military Expenses, April 1, 1943-March 15, 1944 48

6. Highest Degree Held Yearly by Peabody Faculty by Number and Percentage, 1937-1945 85

7. Total and Percentage of Degrees Held by Faculty Members, 1937-1945 87

8. Academic Rank of Peabody Faculty by Number and Percentage, 1937-1945, Where N = 347, and Where N = 154 90

9. List of Committees and Chairmen, 1937, 1940-1945 97

10. Enrollment in Correspondence-Study and Extension Department, 1937-1945 143

11. Enrollment by Divisions of the College, 1937-1945 147

12. Enrollment in the Demonstration School, 1937-1945 155

Table Page

13. Number of Course Offerings by Divisions, 1937, 1945 157

14. Degrees Granted, 1937-1945 163

15. Total Enrollments Excluding all Duplicates, 1937-1944 167

16. Registration by Quarters for the Years 1937-1945, Including Affiliated Schools and Excluding Duplicates 170

17. Approximate Cost per Student Hour of Instruction 174

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Frederick Rudolph has stated that the spirit of change, social protest, and repudiation of the past was one of the most significant characteristics of the American campus in the 1930's, and that change and uncertainty were the order of the day in the 1930's and 1940's.[1] Institutions of higher learning faced both the "shock of uncertainty" and the "test of survival." The administrations of the seats of learning were confronted with problems relating to communism and fascism, student rebellions and strikes, and enrollment and economic drought.

At George Peabody College for Teachers, S. C. Garrison, on the day that the trustees elected him to the office of president,[2] identified four major problems which confronted the college: (1) improvement of the curriculum, (2) improvement of the faculty, (3) inducing bright students to enter the profession of teaching, and (4) finding a nationally-known dean.[1]

---

[1] Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 465-68.

[2] For a list of others who served in administrative positions during the 1937-45 era see Appendix A, pp. 278-81.

Later, he classified problems into two major categories: (1) those dealing with the physical and material needs of the college, and (2) those that pertained to the educational needs.[2] On another occasion he defined the problems facing the administration as being related to the Board of Trustees,[3] the faculty, and the finances of the institution.[4] A year later he diagnosed the problems to be (1) those dealing with the internal program of the college as they related to the operation of the institution, to instruction, and to the development of the educational program; and (2) those relating to financial affairs.[5]

---

[1] Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee), September 21, 1937, p. 421. Cited hereafter as Board Minutes.

[2] Annual Report of the President to the Board of Trustees (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee), May 5, 1938, p. 37. Cited hereafter as Annual Report. Located in S. C. Garrison Papers (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee). Cited hereafter as Garrison Papers.

[3] Cited hereafter as Board.

[4] Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXIX (December, 1940), 14-15. Cited hereafter as Bulletin.

[5] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, pp. 4-5.

He identified teacher education problems as being the shaping of the school toward the future, the selection of teachers, and a definite curriculum.[1] He pointed out that there were regional problems that affected Negroes: Negro education itself and graduate instruction in higher education for Negroes.[2] Other problems in education related to the selection of curriculum for boys and girls and how it should be taught to them so as to be made effective in their lives.[3]

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study has been to identify the problems faced by George Peabody College for Teachers during the years 1937-45, to examine their solutions, and to establish what benefits have accrued to the study of higher education as a result of their identification and solution. More narrowly, this research project has concentrated upon those problems and solutions related to finance, faculty, and the educational program.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Fred McCuistion, November 2, 1936, Garrison Papers. All individuals cited in footnotes are identified in the Identification List, Appendix B, pp. 282-86.

[2] Garrison to McCuistion, January 10, 1938, Garrison Papers.

[3] _Bulletin_, XXIX (December, 1940), 9.

An attempt has been made to answer the following questions:

1. Under what circumstances did the institutional personnel of the era identify the problems?

2. What was the background of each problem?

3. To whom was the responsibility for formulating each solution committed?

4. What other individuals or groups were relied upon for consultation or discussion?

5. What data were utilized in arriving at solutions?

6. What was the rationale for the solutions derived?

7. How successfully were the solutions implemented?

8. What problems remained unsolved?

Limitations of the Study

This paper is a description of a brief period. No attempt has been made for it to be an encyclopedic approach, however. The primary emphasis is on the problems of the areas cited. No effort has been made to list and discuss problems and solutions related to another equally important area of institutional concern, student life; nor does the paper deal with problems relating to the trustees of the college or to the finding of a nationally-known dean. Further, the paper does not dwell in depth upon meaningful operations within the educational purview of the college, specifically, the Division of Surveys and Field Studies, and the Demonstration School. These could be subjected to larger treatment by others.

Because the scope of this paper is limited to a study of the institutional aspects of Peabody College, no attempt has been made to discuss problems of teacher education elsewhere, Negro education, curriculum selection and effective teaching for the secondary and primary grades--all identified by Garrison as being in need of solution.

Justification of the Study

Depression and war caused serious problems to develop for administrators of institutions of higher learning in the era from 1937-45. How these problems were confronted can be an example to administrators and potential administrators. This paper is an attempt to show how Peabody College was able to survive as a private teachers' college during this period of upheaval and emerge as the leading graduate school of education in the South.

This study also fills in a gap in the history of

Peabody College. With its completion it will make possible a continuous reading covering the years 1914-45.

Related Studies

Including Cornell,[1] Georgia Tech,[2] Johns Hopkins,[3] Mars Hill,[4] and Yale,[5] several institutions have been the subject of investigations by scholars. Though there have been many ways of presenting institutional history, most historians have used one of two methods: (1) viewing the subject as a part of the intellectual and educational history of the times, or (2) presenting an institutional biography.[6] The second method is the most frequently used of the two and is characteristic of those cited above.

Generally, these authors attempted a broad sweep, proceeded chronologically and topically, and concentrated upon physical and educational development. Origins, presidents, faculty, students, social life, and the intellectual spirit were also emphasized. There was little treatment of the larger social and academic contexts.

---

[1] Morris Bishop, A History of Cornell (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962).

[2] M. L. Brittain, The Story of Georgia Tech (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948).

[3] John C. French, A History of the University Founded by Johns Hopkins (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946).

[4] John Angus McLeod, From These Stones: Mars Hill College, The First One Hundred Years (Mars Hill College: 1955).

[5] George Wilson Pierson, Yale College: An Educational History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952).

[6] David D. Henry, "A History of Cornell," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (April, 1963), 235.

Other studies have dealt with George Peabody College for Teachers. The ancestral line of the college begins with Davidson Academy (1785-1806), extends through Cumberland College (1806-26), the University of Nashville (1826-75), the State Normal College (1875-87), Peabody Normal College (1887-1909), and comes to fulfillment with the founding of George Peabody College for Teachers in 1909. The college has been the subject of two types of institutional biography: (1) those emphasizing the college itself, and (2) those centering upon particular presidents.

In the former category are the dissertations of Kenimer Houze Morgan and Edward Neely Cullum. Morgan's study is a two-volume treatise, "History of the University of Nashville, 1825-1850,"[1] dealing with a period concurrent with the presidency of Philip Lindsley. It is concerned with the background of the school, its periods of rise and decline, the faculty, student life, and a general appraisal of the institution's effectiveness.

---

[1] Kenimer Houze Morgan, "The University of Nashville, 1825-1850," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 575 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960).

Cullum's paper, "George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1937," covers the period of the administration of Bruce Ryburn Payne. It presents an examination of the purposes of the institution, fiscal and physical growth, relations with Vanderbilt University, the administrative structure, personalities, and campus life. It concludes with an evaluation of the educational endeavor of Peabody College.[1]

Four dissertations have been biographical. The successor to Philip Lindsley was his son whose life is depicted in the volume, "The Life and Works of John Berrien Lindsley," by John E. Windrow.[2] Lindsley served as Chancellor of the University of Nashville from 1855-70 and was a pioneer of public education and a champion of public health.

---

[1] Edward Neely Cullum, "George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1937," Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 231 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963).

[2] John Edwin Windrow, "The Life and Works of John Berrien Lindsley," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 231 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937).

Eugene Melville Waffle has written about the president of the State Normal College. His three-volume work is entitled "Eben Sperry Stearns: Pioneer of Public Education."[1] Stearns, who served from 1875-87, is pictured as a pioneer in teacher education, an experimenter in practical education for women, and the chief official of the new Nashville school which was considered to be the nucleus of public education in the South.

Before he became president of Peabody Normal College in 1887, William Harold Payne was the first faculty member in the United States to be appointed a professor of education. In his volume, The Contribution of William Harold Payne to Public Education,[2] George Cleveland Poret deals with Payne's life and education, and portrays him as being interested in the science and art of education and the education of teachers. Poret analyzes his career as a teacher, reformer, and idealist.

---

[1] Eugene Melville Waffle, "Eben Sperry Stearns: Pioneer of Public Education," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 253 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1939).

[2] George Cleveland Poret, The Contribution of William Harold Payne to Public Education, Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 81 (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930).

The man with perhaps the most varied career before he served as president of Peabody Normal College was the subject of a dissertation by Wallis Beasley. This work, The Life and Educational Contributions of James D. Porter,[1] records Porter's service as lawyer and legislator, soldier and judge, governor of Tennessee, railroad president, and statesman and diplomat.

A very brief paper of major importance is that of Lenna Adele Cowgill: "Thomas B. Craighead--Minister, Educator."[2] Craighead served as president of Davidson Academy from its beginning until after it became Cumberland College, or from 1785-1809. The author discusses Craighead's genealogy, his career as president of the academy and college, and his difficulties in the ministry following his resignation as president.

A biography of a former chancellor of the University of Nashville, who served from 1870-75, has been written by Joseph Howard Parks entitled General Edmund Kirby Smith,

---

[1] Wallis Beasley, The Life and Educational Contributions of James D. Porter, Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 405 (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1950).

[2] Lenna Adele Cowgill, "Thomas B. Craighead--Minister, Educator" (unpublished theme, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937).

C.S.A.[1] Very little mention is made of his service to the college, however. Most of the volume is devoted to his military career and his life at the University of the South.

Other writings of value are "The Curriculum of the University of Nashville" by Joseph Roemer[2] and two volumes by A. L. Crabb: The Genealogy of George Peabody College for Teachers Covering a Period of One Hundred and Fifty Years[3] and The Historical Background of Peabody College Covering a Period of One Hundred and Fifty-five Years.[4]

Some studies deal with faculty members who served Peabody College during the 1937-45 period: "The American Career of Michael John Demiaskevich,"[5] "The Educational

---

[1] Joseph Howard Parks, General Edmund Kirby Smith, C.S.A., Southern Biography Series (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1954).

[2] Joseph Roemer, "The Curriculum of the University of Nashville" (unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1915).

[3] A. L. Crabb, The Genealogy of George Peabody College for Teachers Covering a Period of One Hundred and Fifty Years (Nashville: 1935).

[4] A. L. Crabb, The Historical Background of Peabody College Covering a Period of One Hundred and Fifty-five Years (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941).

[5] George Keiser Evans, "The American Career of Michael John Demiaskevich," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 568 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958).

Philosophy of Michael John Demisakevich,"[1] "The Life and Works of Lucy Gage, Pioneer Teacher and Leader,"[2] The Life and Works of Charles Edgar Little,[3] and Growth of a Philosophy: Hanor A. Webb.[4]

Biographical studies of faculty members of an earlier era are "Fletcher Bascom Dresslar: His Life and Works,"[5] and "A Biography of Professor William Knox Tate: Southern 'Educational Engineer.'"[6] An extensive treatment of the faculty who served during the administration of Bruce Ryburn Payne was completed by Bess McCann: "The Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1936."[1] Many of those cited continued to serve during the administration of S. C. Garrison.

---

[1] Gurney Chambers, "The Educational Philosophy of Michael John Demiaskevich," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 708 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1967).

[2] Carrie Bailey, "The Life and Works of Lucy Gage, Pioneer Teacher and Leader" (unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960).

[3] James O. Baird, The Life and Works of Charles Edgar Little, Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 404 (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1949).

[4] Jacob W. Shapiro, Growth of a Philosophy: Hanor A. Webb (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, Bureau of Publications, 1963).

[5] Robert M. Cochrane, "Fletcher Bascom Dresslar: His Life and Works," Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 46 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1955).

[6] Howard O. Long, "A Biography of Professor William Knox Tate: Southern 'Educational Engineer,'" Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 466 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1952).

Any treatise dealing with the history of this institution must give consideration to the philanthropic theories and practices of the man after whom this college is named. Franklin Parker has produced a definitive biography about him: "George Peabody, 1785-1869, Founder of Modern Philanthropy."[2] An earlier volume is that of Harvey Guy Swanson, "A Type of Biography: George Peabody."[3]

An understanding of the disposition of the funds George Peabody allocated for educational purposes is essential to an understanding of the history of the founding of George Peabody College for Teachers. Three dissertations record the story of this fund: An Interpretation of the Early Administration of the Peabody Education Fund,[1] "The Administration of the Peabody Education Fund from 1880-1905,"[2] and "Third Phase of the Peabody Education Fund, 1904-1919."[3] Two works center on the men who served consecutively as administrators of the fund: "The Life and Educational Contributions of Barnas Sears"[4] and "Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry, Educational Crusader."[5]

---

[1] Bess McCann, "The Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1936" (unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1936).

[2] Franklin Parker, "George Peabody, 1785-1869, Founder of Modern Philanthropy," Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 70 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956).

[3] Harvey Guy Swanson, "A Type Study in Biography: George Peabody" (unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1917).

---

[1] Hoy Taylor, An Interpretation of the Early Administration of the Peabody Education Fund, Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 114 (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1933).

[2] Edward Bane Robert, "The Administration of the Peabody Education Fund from 1880-1905," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 225 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1936).

[3] Joseph Walter Brouillette, "The Third Phase of the Peabody Education Fund, 1904-1914," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 280 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960).

[4] Earle Huddleston West, "The Life and Educational Contribution of Barnas Sears," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 601 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961).

[5] Richard Connally Peck, "Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry," Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 228 (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1942).

Sources of the Data

Several sources were utilized in the writing of the paper. Material that was deemed directly applicable to the development of the purpose was identified for inclusion. Only material that could be documented was incorporated.

The papers of S. C. Garrison were located on the campus. In addition to the 203 folders belonging to the Garrison era, written matter was identified which related to the administrations of Bruce Ryburn, who preceded Garrison as President, and Henry H. Hill, who was Garrison's successor. A few folders contained material relevant to the Payne-Garrison era, some to the Garrison-Hill era, and others to the Payne-Garrison-Hill era.

An effort was made to locate the papers of former or present trustees, faculty members, or administrators who were associated with the college during the time under investigation. Very little material of this nature was available for inspection, and nothing of significance to the study was discovered in what was examined.

The minutes of the meetings of the Board and of the faculty were invaluable to this research project. Acting President Henry H. Hill gave permission to use the three volumes of Board Minutes that covered this period. The two volumes of Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty were secured from the archivist of the Peabody College Library. Permission was sought and granted to Xerox applicable material originating from these sources.

An effort was made to interview institutional personnel connected with Peabody College during the era under consideration. The purposes of the interviews were to discuss problems already identified and to identify and to discuss others.

Letters requesting interviews were sent to thirty-eight individuals in the Nashville area.[1] An affirmative reply was received on a return card from twenty. Twelve others stated that they did not choose to be interviewed, and six did not answer.

A follow-up letter was sent to those replying in the affirmative.[2] It contained a more elaborate statement of the problems, in outline form, and a statement that an interview time would be sought. At the interview conversations were recorded on tape and were later transcribed. Quotations arising from the meetings were included in this paper only when authorized by the interviewee. Permission was sought and obtained through the mails.[1]

---

[1] Appendix C, pp. 287-91. See p. 288.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 290.

A letter was sent to eleven people not in the Nashville area asking them to write their comments on the problems listed and to list and comment on problems not identified.[2] Brief responses were received from two, three respondents stated that they had no information to contribute, and six did not reply.

Three Peabody College publications that were utilized were the Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers; the Peabody Journal of Education; and The Peabody Reflector and Alumni News (appearing as The Peabody Reflector from January, 1941).

Issues of the Bulletin were published monthly, except in the years 1937 and 1938. Forty-five issues dealt with quarterly course schedules; nine others constituted the college catalog. Lists of faculty members, trustees, administrators, and course offerings cited in the study were obtained from the latter group. Featured in some issues were Nursing Education, Health and Physical Education, the Library School, Science, and the Correspondence-Study

---

[1] Ibid., p. 291.

[2] Ibid., p. 289.

Courses. Fourteen issues featured general information about the college.

The Peabody Journal of Education, published bimonthly by the faculty of the college, provided little useful information for the study. Though a scholarly journal, its content was much broader than the narrow scope of this paper. Much more information was provided by The Peabody Reflector and Alumni News, a monthly magazine devoted to the interests of the alumni of the college. Of particular usefulness were the sections labeled "The President's Page," "Campus News," and "Editorials." Issues often contained promotional and follow-up articles referring to significant campus educational activities.

Newspaper articles, which had been collected into scrapbooks, were read in the office of the News Bureau of Peabody College. Microfilms from the libraries of the Nashville Banner and the Nashville Tennessean were also read. The clipping files of the newspapers were searched for articles pertinent to the study. There was no student newspaper at this time at the college.

The card catalog of the library was searched for published and unpublished studies that were directly or indirectly related to the scope, content, or purpose of the paper.

Over 200 doctoral dissertations, specialists in education independent studies, and master's theses were selected for investigation. All having relevancy to this paper are cited in the section of the dissertation labeled "Related Studies."[1]

Limitations of the Data

In the search for data several limitations were encountered including those related to faculty minutes, interviews, and newspapers.

The available Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty, almost stenographic reports of motions, resolutions, or conclusions, and the discussions which followed, are dated from May 12, 1937, through August, 1939. Records exist for only four meetings beyond this point, two each in 1940 and 1941. Three of these accounts had no date, but they were dated by comparing their content with graduation records in the Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Trustees. No records of faculty meetings beyond 1941 and through 1945 have been located.

Only 53 per cent of those contacted consented to be interviewed; however, 82 per cent of those asked to comment by letter on the problems of the institution submitted statements. Most interviewees had a thorough knowledge of at least one phase of institutional life, but rarely were they able to comment at length about all three phases under investigation. For the most part, they were strong with reference to knowledge about the faculty and curriculum; they were weak in their knowledge of finance. Those who had an extensive comprehension of financial matters showed less knowledge about curricular problems. Administrators tended to have a broad view of the aspects of the institution, faculty a less comprehensive understanding, and staff personnel a limited perspective.

---

[1] A list of other studies about Peabody College can be found in Appendix D, pp. 292-305.

The microfilms of the *Nashville Banner* and the *Nashville Tennessean*, which cover the whole period being considered, reveal that there were only a few stories in the papers concerning the college. There are accounts of all annual Board meetings, except one, but they emphasize mostly the election of trustees to the Board. The *Nashville Banner* does not have clippings on the college back to the beginning of the era under consideration because some records were inadvertently destroyed. All of the editions of the *Nashville Tennessean* published since 1947 have been clipped and filed. Only a few clippings were filed before then, most of them after 1943.

Organization of the Data

The following chapter titles reflect the division of the data gathered and constitute an outline of the areas of the dissertation: "Problems Related to Finance," "Problems Related to the Faculty," "Problems Related to the Educational Program," and "Conclusion." The Bibliography is followed by an Appendix which contains certain definitive information pertinent to the study.

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS RELATED TO FINANCE

When Garrison became president of Peabody, the nation was in the throes of a depression. Many businesses and banks had failed, and many individuals had been wiped out financially with all savings and investments lost. The federal government had stepped in with corrective measures that put people back to work and money into circulation. Premature withdrawal of funds through cancellation of promising programs sent the economy into a recession in 1937 and left eleven million people unemployed. College and university enrollments had dropped considerably, and, not surprisingly, the nation's birth rate was at an all-time low. Two years later, after Hitler's legions had marched unopposed into the Rhineland, Austria, and the Sudetenland, the Second World War started with an invasion of Poland by both Germany and Russia.

No one knew for sure what the future held. Garrison stated that businessmen, bankers and manufacturers especially, were terribly afraid.[1] He pictured educational finances as being tight and admitted that some of the major institutions were on shaky financial ground. "Many," he stated, "were running deficits and had been for some years, even the most wealthy ones."[2] He looked forward to better days, predicting that the war would be over by 1946 or 1947.

He complained that the government was spending money in large amounts overseas in activities that seemed to be unrelated to the war effort. He regretted that there was so much waste and extravagance in Washington, but he expressed his appreciation of those who tried to limit the expenditures of the war to the war effort alone.[3]

Garrison thought that institutions of higher learning were going to have a very trying period for a few years, and he hoped that they would pull through.[4] Most of the colleges, especially the private ones, had been badly hurt financially by both depression and war.[1] He depended heavily on the Board for support in this crisis:

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Lorena Stretch, May 16, 1940, Garrison Papers.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Jennings B. Sanders, December 17, 1943, Garrison Papers.

[3] Letter from S. C. Garrison to J. Percy Priest, February 7, 1944, Garrison Papers.

[4] Garrison to Stretch, September 14, 1942, Garrison Papers.

> Without the whole-hearted support of the Board the administration would be practically powerless in the face of the many problems which confront it. We have been strengthened and have been able to carry on our work under what often have been trying conditions because we have felt that the Board was interested in the college and that the Board believed in what it was doing and in the policies of the administration.[2]

He intended that the Board know what was happening at the school, especially with regard to financial matters. He felt that the members would have a better insight into the workings of the college, its problems, and its educational philosophy.[3]

Each year in its annual meeting, the Board elected new members and officers, and appointed its committees.[4] It ratified the actions of the Executive Committee, passed resolutions, counted securities, accepted the reports of the president and the treasurer, and approved the annual budget. When the Board was not in session, its business was transacted by the Executive Committee, which was empowered to act under the bylaws of the college charter. This committee met periodically, mostly for the purpose of acting on financial matters.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, May 21, 1943, Garrison Papers.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, p. 33, Garrison Papers.

[3] Ibid., p. 36.

[4] For a list of the trustees who served during this period see Appendix E, pp. 306-09.

At the meeting of the Board at which Garrison was elected president of Peabody, the Board passed the following resolution:

> RESOLVED, That President Garrison be requested to study, first, the details of a general policy for presentation to the Board; and second, any adjustments in the budget and then ask for a special meeting of the trustees to consider these topics.[1]

The Financial Status of the College

In a study made for the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, correlations between institutional excellence and financial factors were shown to be exceptionally high, "indicating that adequacy of financing is in general a superior index of institutional excellence."[2] Factors of significance were the amount of stable income available to an institution; expenditures, especially for educational purposes; and indebtedness. A discussion of these factors as they relate to Peabody follows together with a statement of the institution's endowment and assets.

---

[1] Board Minutes, September 21, 1938, p. 421.

[2] John Dale Russell, The Finance of Higher Education (Rev. ed.; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 3.

Income

Peabody's income in this era totaled over $6,500,000.00 for an average of $722,526.00 yearly.[1] It rose in 1938 over the previous year and continued rising until 1941 when it began a decline that lasted until 1944. The highest total was achieved in 1945, the lowest was reached in 1943. If the amount received from auxiliary enterprises is deleted, the income totaled in the vicinity of $5,133,000.00 or, an average of $597,139.00 yearly. Considered in this manner, the highest total was reached in 1940, the lowest in 1944.

Tuition was the chief source of income, totaling $2,528,898.00, for a yearly average of $280,988.00. This amounted to 39 per cent of the aggregate. Receipts from this item fluctuated from a high of $359,663.00 in 1940 to a low of $209,802.00 in 1943. These figures included payments of old bills and notes for tuition.

Another major source, 25 per cent of all income, was the return on endowment investments. The high reached in 1937 was not met again. The amounts shifted to lower levels, with the lowest return being received in 1943. The average yield each year was $181,632.00, for a total of over $1,500,000.00 over the nine-year period. The chief source of investment earnings was bonds, followed by stocks and real estate.

---

[1] Information in this section was gleaned from the Annual Reports of the Treasurer to the Board of Trustees, 1937-45. Cited hereafter as Treasurer Reports. See Appendix F, pp. 310-19.

Income from auxiliary enterprises was $966,185.00 or $107,354.00 yearly. This included proceeds from scholarship funds, the bookstore, the cafeteria, and Knapp Farm. Receipts totaled 16 per cent of the monies collected. Income for this segment was highest in 1939 and lowest in 1943. In 1944, the auxiliary enterprises (non-budget) of the Peabody Demonstration School and the General Administration of the Army Air Force unit on the campus were carried for the first time. To maintain consistency in comparing income by years, these new entries have been eliminated from the figures presented.

The rent from dormitories comprised the fourth largest source of income for the college, or 9 per cent of the whole amount. The total collected was $596,622.00 averaging $66,291.00 yearly. The sum was highest in 1940 and lowest in 1944. Though Army Air Force personnel utilized two residences during their stay on the campus, earnings from this income were not included in the figures because it was handled through another accounting item.

The Peabody Demonstration School did not appear in the college budget until 1939. Income from 1939 through 1945 totaled $419,915.00 for an average yearly amount of $59,988.00, or 7 per cent of all receipts. The income for the school was lowest in 1940 and highest in 1945. Receipts for the year 1938 were $56,966.00, but figures for 1937 were not found, despite the fact that a thorough search was made of the files of the Demonstration School and the records of the Peabody business office.[1]

The college also received money from other sources: correspondence study, extension work, diploma fees, student library fines, cap and gown rentals and sales, garage rents, infirmary usage, and annuity fund investments. The aggregate was 4 per cent of all monies collected, or $28,901.00 yearly.

Expenditures

Expenditures totaled almost $6,000,000.00 for an average of $663,072.00 yearly.[1] Expenses were highest in 1945 and lowest in 1943. When expenditures did not include the item, Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget, the total fell to almost $5,000,000.00, for an average yearly rate of $546,631.00. The year 1941 had the greatest expenditure, 1944 the least.

---

[1] Letter from Mary McNulty to John R. Petry, May 19, 1967.

Expenses for instruction totaled $2,133,000.00. This averaged $262,079.00 yearly, and it amounted to 39 per cent of the total expenditures. In 1941 the greatest dispersement was made; in 1943 the lowest amount was expended.

The second highest outlay was for auxiliary enterprises such as scholarships, bookstore operations, the cafeteria, and Knapp Farm. A total of $883,743.00 was expended for an average of $99,305.00 yearly. The amount equaled to 14 per cent of all expenses. The highest amount was paid in 1945, the lowest in 1943. The third largest amount went for General Administration and Expense. The average yearly expenditure was $86,678.00, based on a total of $780,106.00. This was equivalent to 13 per cent of money spent. The highest amount was reached in 1941, the lowest in 1943.

---

[1] Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45. See Appendix G, pp. 320-29.

Spending for the Demonstration School amounted to $500,254.00, or a yearly average of $71,365.00. This represented 8 per cent of the budgetary expenditures. The total increased from a low of $61,447.00 in 1939 to a high of $85,812.00 in 1945. The figures for 1938, when $58,732.00 was spent, were not included because this item was not in the college budget. Figures for 1937 were not located.

In some of the Current Expense reports the item Physical Plant and General Services appeared as Operation and Maintenance of the Physical Plant. This was the fifth major area of expenditure, and it accounted for 8 per cent of the total. A total of $495,246.00 was spent over the nine years. This averaged $55,027.00 yearly, with the highest being spent in 1945, the lowest in 1938.

Costs for residence halls totaled almost $300,000.00 for an average of $32,664.00 yearly. This equaled to 5 per cent of all expenses. The largest amount was spent in 1940, the lowest in 1942.

Library designations for salaries, expenses, books and periodicals added up to $282,588.00 for a yearly average of $31,398.00. The highest and lowest amounts were spent in the years 1940 and 1942 respectively. Expenses in this area totaled 5 per cent of the gross expenditures.

The institution paid out money for other expenses, namely, organized research, correspondence study and extension work, the infirmary, annuity interest, and annuity and maintenance fees for property owned by the college. This amounted to 8 per cent of all expenditures, or $53,045.00 yearly.

Indebtedness

Garrison stated that to act in a conservative manner so as not to incur any indebtedness was the best course and was the policy of the institution.[1] Through the years he was able to guide the college into saving more than $500,000.00 by following this tenet.

In every year there was a surplus of income over expenditures. The average surplus amounted to $59,453.00 yearly with the largest balance occurring in 1939. The smallest came in 1942.[2] (See Table 1.) The major portion was realized from the Educational and General classification of the budget. Almost 85 per cent, or $454,475.00, came from this area. The remaining 15 per cent, or $80,606.00, came from the Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget category.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to H. J. Mikell, March 21, 1941, Garrison Papers.

[2] Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45.

TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIP OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES, 1937-1945[a]

Year	Income	Expenditures	Income Surplus
1937	$ 637,304.00	$ 605,432.00	$ 31,872.00
1938	679,391.00	598,925.00	80,466.00
1939[b]	771,769.00	674,026.00	97,743.00
1940	790,148.00	729,411.00	60,737.00
1941	785,376.00	747,294.00	38,082.00
1942	699,534.00	678,273.00	21,261.00
1943	623,620.00	552,662.00	70,958.00
1944	691,346.00	616,589.00	74,757.00
1945	824,240.00	765,035.00	59,205.00
Totals	6,502,733.00	5,967,647.00	535,081.00
Averages	722,526.00	663,072.00	59,453.00

[a] Source: Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45.

[b] Peabody Demonstration School included in Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget for the first time.

Endowment and Assets

The total value of endowment holdings--stocks, bonds, loans, and real estate--at the end of 1945 was $5,367,750.00. President Henry H. Hill stated that while this was not a great amount, Peabody ranked sixty-third among the 1,686 institutions of higher learning in the United States in funds devoted to endowment purposes.[1] This was an increase of $664,526.00 over the amount of endowment on January 1, 1937, for an average of $73,836.00 annually. (See Table 2.) The greatest gain took place in the period from 1943-45 when additions amounted to more than $100,000.00 yearly. The years 1940-42 were lean, averaging an increase of only $20,679.00.[2]

The total assets of the college were valued at $10,250,000.00 on December 31, 1945. This was an increase of $1,271,030.00 over January 1, 1937, for an average of $141,225.00 annually. There was a decrease in assets from January 1, 1937, to the end of that year, but each succeeding year saw an increase. The largest growth occurred in 1943, the lowest in 1942.[3] (See Table 3.)

---

[1] Annual Report, May 9, 1946.

[2] Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45.

[3] *Ibid*.

TABLE 2

INCREASE IN ENDOWMENT VALUE, 1937-1945[a]

Year	Endowment		Increase
1936[b]	$4,703,224.00		
1937	4,826,820.00		$123,606.00
1938	4,908,898.00		82,068.00
1939	4,947,689.00		38,791.00
1940	4,963,033.00		15,344.00
1941	4,988,466.00		25,413.00
1942	5,009,727.00		21,281.00
1943	5,128,661.00		118,934.00
1944	5,228,966.00		100,305.00
1945[c]	5,367,750.00		138,784.00
		Total	664,526.00
		Average	73,836.00

[a] Source: Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45.

[b] As of December 31, 1936.

[c] As of December 31, 1945.

TABLE 3

INCREASE IN ASSETS, 1937-1945[a]

Year	Assets		Increase
1936[b]	$ 8,895,838.00		
1937	8,981,999.00		$ - 3,839.00
1938	9,160,634.00		178,634.00
1939	9,301,433.00		140,799.00
1940	9,414,254.00		112,821.00
1941	9,544,220.00		129,966.00
1942	9,611,080.00		66,869.00
1943	9,870,744.00		259,664.00
1944	10,116,464.00		245,720.00
1945[c]	10,256,868.00		140,404.00
		Total	1,271,030.00
		Average	141,225.00

[a] Source: Treasurer's Reports, 1936-45.

[b] As of December 31, 1936.

[c] As of December 31, 1945.

Financial Problems and Their Solutions

The administration pledged itself to proceed as cautiously as it deemed best for the institution. It geared itself for any possible financial crises by deciding that "less important and more unnecessary things" around the college would be eliminated or curtailed.[1] Despite these precautions there were a number of pressing problems that faced the college.

Income

Though there was a surplus of income over expenditures each year, the college did not enjoy the certainty of such a situation. Student fees and endowment returns constantly concerned the administration. There was also the need for working capital. School officials sought to counteract these problems with positive action, such as managing endowment investments to receive a more significant return, seeking additional enrollment, and adding to the working capital.

Management of endowment funds

A problem distressing to the administration was the failure of endowment income to increase. Although endowment funds had increased from $4,800,000.00 to $5,300,000.00, at no point did the actual income reach the amount attained in 1937. (See Table 4.)

---

[1] Garrison to Mikell, May 18, 1940, Garrison Papers.

TABLE 4

ENDOWMENT INCOME, 1937-1945[a]

Year	Income
1937	$ 198,164.00
1938	183,533.00
1939	186,504.00
1940	174,810.00
1941	179,662.00
1942	182,702.00
1943	172,571.00
1944	180,233.00
1945	176,512.00
Total	1,634,691.00
Average	181,632.00

[a] Source: Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45.

The need of the college was for the percentage of return on investments to remain the same or to gain instead of decreasing as it did during this time of increasing activity on the money market. The problem was compounded by the failure of the endowment funds to increase sufficiently to produce the amount of income needed.

Garrison complained that the extravagance of the federal government in granting loans and funding projects around the world hurt the nation's economy.

> The national administration spent money so wildly before the war that now our national debt is piling up and the result is that the income from endowment in all colleges is decreasing very rapidly.[1]

Approximately 30 per cent of the endowment was invested in railroad funds, and Garrison stated that unless the Interstate Commerce Commission took a more enlightened attitude the college would lose a great deal of income on the bonds.[2]

The decreasing income prohibited colleges from giving aid they normally would have given students.[3] Garrison maintained that decreased income meant that the college would have to finance its program from student fees and tuition. This would change the spirit of the program and the college would have to bid for students. Bidding for students would cause the institution to change its program to fit the desires of the students it attracted. This was foreign to his concept of the independent institution.

---

[1] Garrison to Stretch, September 14, 1942, Garrison Papers.

[2] Garrison to Mikell, January 22, 1940, p. 2, Garrison Papers.

[3] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Walter M. Breme, December 28, 1939, Garrison Papers.

> So long as an institution has a substantial income other than that from fees and tuition, it is able to maintain independently a rather stable, conservative program. When it becomes necessary to finance the institution from student fees and tuition an entirely different program must be built--one which, in my judgment, is nothing more than a swing to the left.[1]

Because the administration desired to forgo its own program relatively free from pressures, it was imperative that the endowment be invested consistently with safety and at a reasonable return.[2] In 1940 the Investment Committee of the Board was finding it very difficult to make wise investments. Rather large sums of uninvested money accumulated. To produce income that could be applied to the expenditures, it became necessary to turn the funds into sound investments.[3] The Board proceeded cautiously.

> You take investment policies. That is a difficult assignment any way you take it. I think that the attitude of the trustees ever since I have known anything about them has been the holding of the affairs of Peabody as a sacred trust-as they should-and countenance nothing that would tend to diminish the effectiveness of Peabody in the accomplishment of its purpose. . . . I think that you will find throughout the whole thread of

---

[1] Garrison to Mikell, January 22, 1940, p. 2, Garrison Papers.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid.

> Peabody's existence that the trustees have been mindful to protect with prudence the funds in their hands.[1]

The president also worried about a bill pending before Congress which would tax the endowment income of colleges and universities. He wrote Senator Kenneth D. McKellar for protection for private colleges, warning that this tax, if passed, would tend to kill off the existing private institutions.[2]

Making the picture more complex was the contention of the administration that specific services which were already a part of the educational program should be endowed. These services were needed by the region and were of such nature that they could not be supported from tuition income. The services and their yearly costs were Dual Education (the investigation of Negro education and the furnishing of counsel and advice to Negro institutions), $5,000.00; the School Building Service, $5,000.00; Scholarships, $8,000.00; Publications, $4,000.00; Religious Work, $4,000.00; and the Bureau of International Correspondence (organized to promote better international understanding through correspondence between American and foreign young people), $4,000.00.[1] According to Garrison, the total to endow these non-instructional education services would be in the vicinity of $750,000.00.

---

[1] Interview with Walter Stokes, Jr., June 6, 1967.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Kenneth D. McKellar, May 5, 1942, Garrison Papers.

The college recognized the need for offering additional instructional services in the fields of science education, home economics education, social science education, health education, music education, art education, speech and dramatics, business education, government, children's literature, agricultural economics, library education, and the philosophy of education.[2] Extending these services would require an additional $1,650,000.00 when capitalized at 5 per cent interest.

Efforts to improve the performance of endowment investments were made. Halfway through this era the Board voted to transfer the annual housekeeping job of counting securities to the Nashville Trust Company with a stipulation that an accounting of the securities be made on demand. The action was implemented by the Executive Committee.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 11, 1939, pp. 6-8, Garrison Papers.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Board Minutes, May 9, 1940, p. 258.

This move was not entirely satisfactory because of the nature of the investment company.

> The trust company was a notoriously conservative institution. That personality of the conservative institution was reflected in the investment of the college. . . . The General Education Board was following a more intelligent investment advice.[2]

This was followed by a request of the Executive Committee for authority to increase the investment of stocks from its limit of 20 per cent to 30 per cent of the funds. The Board voted by mail to grant the committee's proposal.[3] Later, the Board passed a motion designating the committee to investigate the endowment investment policies of other institutions and to bring recommendations to the trustees.[4]

The depression brought in its wake the serious problem of defaulting on payments on bonds by issuing parties. On January 1, 1938, defaulted bonds totaled $716,290.00. This was reduced to $442,290.00 one year later through settlement with the Arkansas Baptist State

---

[1] Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, June 14, 1940, p. 541. Cited hereafter as Executive Committee Minutes.

[2] Stokes, interview.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, June 22, 1945.

[4] Board Minutes, May 10, 1945.

Convention (at 35 per cent), the Montgomery Memorial Hospital (settled at 32 per cent), and the Republic of Cuba (reorganized on a 4½ per cent basis).[1]

Further reduction was necessary one year later when settlement was made with the Riverside Baptist Church of Jacksonville, Florida (payment of back interest at 4 per cent and future interest at 2 per cent plus 4 per cent annual reduction of the principal), and with Gibson Hotels, Incorporated, of Huntington, West Virginia. These had a par value of $272,532.00 and represented 10 per cent of the investment in bonds.[2]

Garrison expressed his feelings on this matter:

> We have been working on this matter for some time trying to get the church to refinance itself or begin paying on its bonds. It is a sad commentary on the Christian church that an organization would issue bonds to be brought by charitable trusts such as Peabody College and by those who have saved during their lives and need the income for their support, and yet the church fails to meet its obligations.[3]

In later presidential reports bond defaults, when reorganized, were treated as part of the investment accounts.

---

[1] Annual Report Trustees, May 5, 1938, p. 10.

[2] *Ibid*., May 11, 1939, p. 25.

[3] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Mrs. J. O. Crider, April 10, 1939, Garrison Papers.

Citing the fact that properties in areas away from Nashville were difficult to manage, Garrison encouraged its sale. One such place belonged to Dr. J. L. Minor who deeded it to Peabody on consideration of an annuity of $550.00 yearly. By December of 1937 Minor had been paid $45,000.00 more than had been received in income from his property.[1] Upon his personal inspection Peabody's business manager had concluded that the 164.5 acre estate twenty-one miles southeast of Memphis was not worth much. In 1938 the Executive Committee of the Board approved the selling of it.[2] The last of other Memphis holdings was sold in 1943.

Student fees

To the reduction of endowment income there was added the reduction in the amount of student fees collected. This was caused by a drop in enrollment during most of the war years. In anticipation of such a situation, the president had ordered cost studies made of departments with the idea that the best way to reduce costs was to curtail the activities of departments with low enrollments except those offering courses vital to teacher training. This meant that students would attend Scarritt or Vanderbilt for additional courses beyond the minimum offered by Peabody.

---

[1] Letter from Bradley Walker to Judge H. D. Minor, December 8, 1937, Garrison Papers.

[2] Executive Committee Minutes, January 15, 1938, p. 429.

What Garrison feared for so long was realized in December of 1941. With the entry of the United States into a major conflict, the financial situation began to change rapidly and for the worse. Income from tuition and fees gradually decreased from $350,000.00 in 1941 to $200,000.00 in 1943, a loss of almost 40 per cent. Garrison's belief that college financing was going to be difficult was thus confirmed.

> The Army is taking practically all the men from the colleges, and many of the girls are going into war work. This, of course, is as it should be. Winning the war must be our first objective. Nevertheless, it will create a grave financial situation as far as higher education in America is concerned. Institutions such as Peabody, which emphasize graduate work, will be harder hit than other institutions, because their students are more mature and are, therefore, almost universally eligible for military service, or are already prepared to go to work in some industry or profession.[1]

Military training at the college

To counteract these losses the president sought authority to contact the government for permission to train military recruits on the campus. The Executive Committee supported him in this endeavor.[1] At the annual meeting of the Board in 1943, Garrison announced that the 333rd Army Air Force College Training Detachment (Air Crew) had been established at Peabody with a force of 600 men.[2]

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to C. E. Pigford, September 5, 1942, Garrison Papers.

The training unit contract between the Army and Peabody contained statements concerning provisions for the following: activating expenses, buildings to be used, instruction maintenance and operation, revision of rates, monthly payments, a joint inventory and condition report of all property to be used by the government, title to the property for which payment is made, and termination of the contract. Also included were provisions for disposition of the government property, records, assignment of legal rights, a covenant against contingent fees, dispute amelioration, antidiscrimination in employment, the eight-hour day law, renegotiation in case of excessive profits, and liability for government-owned property.[3]

---

[1] Executive Committee Minutes, March 23, 1943.

[2] Board Minutes, May 6, 1943.

[3] "Contract Between the United States Army Air Force and George Peabody College," Historical Report, 333 ASF, CTD (A.C.), George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, April 1, 1943-March 19, 1944, Volume II, Appendix, Appendix No. 1, Chapter II, pp. 1-17.

Under the terms of the agreement the college received $519,672.00 for services rendered from April 1, 1943, or $15.14 per diem for each man.[1] (See Table 5.) Commissioning expenses totaled $27,285.00, mostly spent for equipment for the physics laboratory, living quarters, and the cafeteria. A large part of this was also spent for books.

The college was paid $40,327.00 for the rental of facilities. Charges were divided into two categories: messing and living quarters, and classrooms. The men utilized two residence halls on the west side of the campus for their eating and sleeping. Classroom instruction was held in the Home Economics, Psychology, and Social-Religious buildings.

Instructional expenses owed to the college totaled $115,061.00. This included payment for teaching and supervisory salaries, current repairs, maintenance, depreciation of equipment, and administration. The teaching of physics, mathematics, and history incurred the greatest expense.

---

[1] Ibid., Appendix No. 2, Chapter II, "Working Data of Contract Between United States Army Air Force and George Peabody College," pp. 1-23. The contract was extended to June 30, 1944, but no contract records are available that give the amount collected. Based on the previous contract, this could have amounted to $33,851.00.

TABLE 5

MAJOR MILITARY EXPENSES, APRIL 1, 1943-MARCH 15, 1944[a]

Commissioning Costs		$ 27,285.00
Equipment	$25,334.00	
Remodeling	1,160.00	
Administration	791.00	
Rental		40,327.00
Classrooms	19,965.00	
Messing and Living Quarters	20,362.00	
Instruction		115,061.00
Operating Costs		74,999.00
Classrooms and Instructional Plant	54,583.00	
Living Quarters	20,416.00	
Messing		262,000.00
		$519,672.00
Average Daily Expenditures per Man		$ 15.14
Projected Total to June 30, 1944		$553,523.00

[a] Source: "Working Data of Contract Between United States Army Air Force and George Peabody College," *Historical Report, 333 ASF, CTD (A.C.), George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, April 1, 1943-March 19, 1944, Volume II, Appendix*, Appendix No. 2, Chapter II, pp. 1-23.

Supervisory salaries were paid to the offices of the president, registrar, and business manager.

Compensation for the operating expenses of the classroom and instructional plant totaled $54,583.00, but this did not include ground maintenance. The basis of the apportionment was figured in square feet. The Army Training School used 48 per cent of the 386,460 square footage of the campus buildings.

The operating expense for the living quarters amounted to $20,416.00, most of this being attributed to direct costs such as utilities, salaries, and laundry and cleaning. Depreciation on equipment and administrative expense equaled less than 10 per cent of the total.

The greatest expense was $262,000.00 for the operation of the mess halls. This was computed at a cost of $36.00 for each man monthly and included costs for administration and depreciation. Garrison mentioned that for all practical purposes the army had taken over the cafeteria facilities of the college because they were so limited.[1]

The presence of the military unit provided a source of income that helped alleviate a declining budget. The president stated to one of the institution's trustees that this money would enable the college to build a much needed facility after the war.

---

[1] Executive Committee Minutes, November 22, 1943.

> Confidentially we earned and saved enough money on the army at Peabody to build a power plant. I think this will cost around $175,000 to $180,000, but we have money as a result of our army venture.[1]

Working capital

In 1937 the school had $32,000.00 in working capital, $28,000.00 of which was owed to President Payne at the time of his death for back salary.[2] The trustees added $2,000.00 to the amount owed and extended the payments of $3,000.00 annually to Mrs. Payne over a ten-year period. This kept the fund from being used up immediately and assured the institution of some amount for emergencies.

By 1941, the working capital had grown to nearly $80,000.00. In the latter part of 1944 it had reached $127,772.00, and by December 31, 1945, increased to $172,914.00.[3] In commenting on the condition of the college at the beginning of his tenure as president, President Hill stated that among the assets of the institution was a fiscal balance sheet showing no debt and a reasonable working balance.[1] The administration had desired to build up a financial reserve that would some day reach the equivalent of one year's budget expense. It attempted to do this by presenting a balanced budget each year which included a provision for working capital. It was the intent that the budget not be exceeded and that no deficits be incurred.

---

[1] Garrison to Pigford, November 24, 1944, Garrison Papers.

[2] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, pp. 21-22, Garrison Papers.

[3] Gleaned from the financial reports to the Board of Trustees, 1941, 1944, 1945.

The financial report for the year 1945 contained an entry of $290,075.00 in the Current Funds section under the label Restricted-Cash. The money was allocated for the construction and purchase of new buildings and had not been set aside to serve as working capital.[2] The Board passed a resolution that $100,000.00 be transferred from the account to the endowment fund of the Division of Surveys and Field Studies so that the Division could claim a grant of $100,000.00 from the General Education Board.[3]

In an earlier action, the General Education Board offered the college the sum of $50,000.00 for its endowment if the college would pr vide an equal amount from other sources. The following proposal was accepted by the Board.

---

[1] Annual Report, May 9, 1946.

[2] Annual Report, May 10, 1945, p. 35, Garrison Papers.

[3] Board Minutes, May 10, 1945.

> BE IT RESOLVED That $50,000 of moneys in hand be set aside as endowment, income from such to be used for the Division of Field Studies and Surveys which is to be integrated into the Graduate School.[1]

Later, $5,287.00 was transferred by the Executive Committee from current funds to match an equal amount raised by friends of Charles E. Little for establishing a chair in his honor.[2] One former administrator commented that this practice was acceptable:

> If it comes out of your own surplus, and if you wanted to set aside that kind of money, the Board could if it felt that there was a prior claim. They could do this in perfectly good faith, and they would have to make a judgment as to values. As long as a given fund is not restricted by the person who has given it, and as long as it has been put in a position by Board action which said this was the best place to put it, then I don't know any reason why it does not turn out that they can put it any place they wanted.[3]

Contributions of the General Education Board

Though the General Education Board gave the college almost $1,500,000.00 during this time, it was not budgeted either as income or as working capital.[1] The major portion was given for the support of the Joint University Libraries and the School of Library Science. The $1,000,000.00 received by the Joint University Libraries was designated to be used either for the construction of a building and its equipment or for its endowment. The School of Library Science, which had had General Education Board aid since its establishment, was given one grant of $10,000.00 toward general support, a final grant of $100,000.00 to be applied either toward general support over a period of years or toward endowment of the school, and a $15,000.00 grant in support of a professorship in library education for three years.[2]

---

[1] _Ibid_., May 7, 1942.

[2] Executive Committee Minutes, October 4, 1944.

[3] Interview with Doak C. Campbell, June 15, 1967.

The Division of Surveys and Field Studies was promised $250,000.00 in 1942 provided that the amount was matched on or before August 31, 1945. Of this, $50,000.00 was to be applied to supporting funds over a five-year period, the matching amount to be put into endowment. The remainder, $200,000.00, was also to be added to the endowment. By November of 1944 the institution had matched $150,000.00, thus securing for the Division additional endowment of $300,000.00. This brought the endowment total to $550,000.00.[1] The rest was matched in the next year. The major reasons given for granting this money were that capital available for the operation of the Division was diminishing and that graduate study was to be tied in more closely with the activities of the office.[2]

---

[1] Letter from Flora M. Rhind to John Petry, February 14, 1967. See Appendix H, pp. 330-34, for a list of gifts from the General Education Board to George Peabody College for Teachers, 1909-45.

[2] Annual Report of the General Education Board, 1940, p. 121. Cited hereafter as General Education Board.

Other grants were given for training in curriculum revision (summer curriculum laboratories for studies and methods of teacher training) and training rural elementary teachers; for the study of facilities for the graduate education of Negroes, of school equipment (with the American Council of Education), of problems related to rural education (by the Southern Rural Life Conference), of community schools of the South, of teacher education for elementary schools; for workshops in community education for county superintendents; for the support of the interstate School Building Service; and for the employment of professors, one an anthropologist to be shared among Peabody, Fisk,

---

[1] Board Minutes, November 20, 1944.

[2] General Education Board, pp. 26-27.

Vanderbilt, and Scarritt, the other an Home Economics teacher at Peabody.[1]

The president was cognizant of the support of the General Education Board and others.

> Philanthropy has played a major part in the development of the cultural life in America. Whatever one might say relative to the accumulation of wealth, it must never be forgotten that there have been men who were more interested in the practical application of their wealth for the benefit of mankind than they were in the wealth itself. These men have been interested in how materials might be used to create a better social, religious, and economic civilization. . . . America's social, economic, and religious life would be poorer had it not been for the contributions of the philanthropists toward the professions of teaching, medicine, preaching, law, and engineering. One can hardly imagine what our civilization would be without the great institutions which have been made possible by men who had a vision of the right use of wealth, men of both large and small means. . . . The gifts of the Peabody Education Fund, the General Education Board, the Carnegie Corporation, and Foundation, the Julius Rosenwald Fund, and many others for further training of teachers and school administrators, research studies, scholarships, fellowships, curriculum revision, and surveys have improved elementary, secondary, and college education. . . . It can be truthfully said that the wise contributions of philanthropists have not only improved the quality of education but have greatly accelerated the progress in the professionalization and organization of teaching in a democratic system of education in America.[2]

---

[1] Rhind to Petry, February 14, 1967.

[2] S. C. Garrison, "The Contribution of the Philanthropists," Peabody Journal of Education, XVII (September, 1939), 105-07.

Alumni support

The alumni were another source of income for working capital; however, few organized campaigns had been conducted to raise funds from this group. Their financial potential for the benefit of the college was considered to be meager, and it was presumed that most former students were unable to make substantial gifts of a supportive nature. However, through the president, the institution came to realize the possibilities of this group.

> If all of us who are sons and daughters of Peabody would pool our resources and aid the College financially, however small our gifts might be, the future of the institution would appear brighter, and we would be assured that Peabody would live on, because we would know that it lived in the hearts of its alumni, that it not only lived in their hearts but that they desired to see it prosper and become an even greater institution.[1]

At a meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, much discussion had been given to the raising of money for college support.

> . . . outside financing of colleges in the future must depend largely upon the increase in the number of small and medium-sized gifts . . . the alumni of institutions must be depended upon for more in the future not only in the matter of individual gifts and bequests but also in the assistance they can give in securing contributions from outside sources, and . . . too few institutions maintain definite and adequate techniques

---

[1] S. C. Garrison, "To the Peabody Alumni," The Peabody Reflector, XVII (September, 1944), 323.

> designed to attract the active cooperation and support of alumni and friends in their financial problems.[1]

Garrison thought that those who had benefited from scholarships, loans, and fellowships in the past could set up a number of revolving loan funds. These resources would relieve the college in its efforts to aid students through tuition grants and other means of financial aid. Each fund would be capable of supporting one student a year with the potential to support more through the years as earned interest was added. The administration based its belief on the value of the money to the past recipients, their accomplishments as well-prepared alumni, and on their interest in educational endeavors.[2]

Loans were needed to provide a financial undergirding for brilliant and potentially useful students who without adequate support could not leave their positions for the college campus.[3] Primary beneficiaries would be graduate students who, when they returned to their jobs, or went to better positions, would be able to repay loans promptly.

---

[1] S. C. Garrison, "Gifts, Bequests, and Memorials," The Peabody Reflector, XII (May, 1939), 163.

[2] S. C. Garrison, "To the Peabody Alumni," The Peabody Reflector, XVII (September, 1944), 323.

[3] S. C. Garrison, "Student Loans, Scholarships, and Fellowships," The Peabody Reflector, XII (April, 1939), 125.

Ideas and plans for the loan funds were more substantial than the monies available. Through the years there was not as much money on hand as was needed; many letters were received requesting aid. If a $100,000.00 fund had been established, up to 160 of the requests could have been honored annually for graduate students.[1] However, there is no record that Garrison's goal was realized.

Salaries

The salary problems of the college did not begin with this era. Wages had been substantially reduced in the early thirties because of the depression. Salary reductions affected the college and Demonstration School teachers, clerical workers, and members of the maintenance staff.

Remuneration for college faculty members

In 1938 the average annual salary of forty-nine professors at Peabody College was $2,878.00, with the range being from $2,000.00 to $7,000.00. They were poorly paid when compared with the better schools of the South such as the University of Texas, the University of North Carolina, Duke, Tulane, and others.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*.

Garrison did not equate high salaries with teaching ability, stating that often those with lower salaries were the better teachers. Those that drew higher salaries were often not progressive and had become satisfied with their performances. He did admit that most of the higher paid professors were good teachers, but stated that:

> In many cases they are worth no more to the college, have no greater national reputation, and are no better teachers than at least an equal number drawing very low salaries.[2]

To make salaries more equitable, the president proposed that the institution draw up a salary scale.

> One of our most serious problems internally is the lack of a salary schedule. Nothing makes for poorer morale than the fact that one man draws a good salary while another man of equal ability, reputation and energy, whose work is just as valuable, draws a much lower salary.[3]

In 1940 a scale was voted in. The salary range for Professors was from $3,000.00 to $4,800.00; for Associate Professors, $2,400.00 to $3,600.00; and for Assistant Professors, from $1,800.00 to $3,000.00. Also passed was a motion to advance salaries progressively over a five-year period and to give distinguished professors greater consideration concerning remuneration.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 51, Garrison Papers.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., pp. 50-51.

By mid-1943 the salary ranges were from $3,600.00 to $5,400.00 for Professors, from $2,400.00 to $3,600.00 for Associate Professors, and from $2,000.00 to $3,000.00 for Assistant Professors. An increment was in force up to $200.00 a year, but the faculty member did not receive it unless he were judged to be a success in that year.[2]

Most of the members of the faculty did not know about the adoption of a salary scale. One teacher was emphatic that there was no scale.

> I am quite sure that there was not (a salary scale). I got the impression from Dr. Garrison that Dr. Payne had instituted an individualistic policy concerning salary. He was opposed to increment for service, and for rank because a person had degrees. Garrison told me that a private institution with limited endowment had to settle for a salary for each individual.[3]

Another stated: "Every major committee that has ever studied things here stated that there had not been one."[4] Those who were told that a scale was adopted commented that it was never administered. The former alumni secretary stated that Garrison did try to establish some equitable standards for salaries and to be as fair as possible to the faculty with the money at hand.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., May 9, 1940, p. 529.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to the Salary Stabilization Unit, June 28, 1943, Garrison Papers.

[3] Interview with Irving Wolfe, May 6, 1967.

[4] Interview with Maycie K. Southall, May 19, 1967.

Increases were delayed in some instances because of the necessity to file an application with the Salary Stabilization Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue each time an increase was due. Salary limitations had been imposed through the Wage Stabilization Law passed by Congress during World War II. Application for increases was made in part because of the additional teaching load put on some faculty members by the presence of the Army pre-flight unit on the campus. In at least one instance, a professor was lost to another institution because of the late confirmation of the request for an increase in his salary. State institutions of higher education were not covered by this law and could adjust their salaries without recourse to the type of action demanded of private colleges and universities. Garrison maintained that this ruling of the Treasury Department and the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor was unfair and made it almost impossible for schools such as Peabody to be competitive where key personnel were involved.[1]

---

[1] Letter from Otis McBride to John Petry, June 26, 1967.

Salary raises were asked for some, but not all, whose salaries were low before the schedules were put into effect.

> There are other individuals who are excellent teachers but who should not be encouraged by salary increases, because the materials which they teach are of little importance in the development of the educational program.[2]

Previous to the salary scale adoption, Board action had been taken whenever there was a request to raise that compensation of individual teachers.[3] The following statements describe the techniques used to secure approval:

> In his report to the Board he would report that he had raised someone's salary. The Board would look upon this as within his sphere of authority so long as he stayed within the bounds of what was budgeted for that. In the main what is practiced is that he can employ and then report his action to the Executive Committee of the Board. He might want--in an exceptional case--the advice and counsel of his Executive Committee which is local and can get together very quickly and meet.[4]

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to William M. Eaves, September 8, 1943, Garrison Papers.

[2] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 51, Garrison Papers.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, May 25, 1939, p. 486.

[4] Stokes, interview.

After the adoption of the schedule the Board acted only to approve the employment of faculty personnel and to set their basic salaries.

In other actions the Board established a policy whereby some faculty could be hired for three quarters instead of four.[1] Peabody was one of the major institutions which had teaching personnel on a four-quarter basis. Garrison desired that this be changed.

> Not only is it deadening to teach four quarters in a row, year after year, but it is expensive to the institution. Capable teachers can be hired for much lower salaries in the summer than during other periods.[2]

In addition, the Executive Committee passed an action enabling the institution to pay fixed salary equivalents to certain employees who enjoyed side benefits such as room, board, or travel payments.[3] Also, the practice of paying a part-time music instructor the fees of his students was discontinued when it was discovered that the fees totaled more than the salary of a full-time professor in the music department.[4]

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 438.

[2] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 51, Garrison Papers.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, October 1, 1937, p. 424.

[4] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, p. 11, Garrison Papers.

Payment to Demonstration School teachers

When the salaries of the college teachers were reduced so were those of the teachers at the Demonstration School. The faculty of the Demonstration School were not treated in the same manner as that at the college.

> The college always had a catch-as-catch-can system with the salaries. You got what you could. The Demonstration School was never on a rank basis with the college. We appointed a committee on that, and, when we found out who was the fellow appointed chairman it was sealed that we would not have any more meetings like that. The salary adjustments were never put on a par with them regardless of degrees or tenure. Of course, they have had their inequities on the campus, too. But they did not all get the same rating on the basis of tenure, or preparation, either. . . . Finally, there was a salary scale worked out for the college, but the Demonstration School did not get to participate in it. If they had given us rank, we would have come in on the schedule. They just said that we were high school teachers. They talked about it several times, but it was never thrashed out.[1]

It was not until mid-1944 that the institution made an effort to readjust Demonstration School salaries. It then asked the Salary Stabilization Unit in Atlanta, Georgia, for permission to restore them.

> Certain salaries (fifteen) it seems to me should be readjusted. Three of these salaries were reduced from $3,600 to $3,000; twelve were reduced from $2,700 to $2,100. We desire to restore $300 per year to each of these fifteen salaries. This seems fair and will put our salaries in line with similar positions in the

---

[1] Interview with B. S. Holden, June 7, 1967.

better institutions in this area. This is evidently a salary restoration and not a salary increase.[1]

Despite this effort the Demonstration School faculty had not been restored to their predepression salary status by the end of 1945. Further, many professors (in the college) had had no increases since 1930.[2]

Compensation to clerical and janitorial personnel

One of the most necessary restorations of salary cuts was for the clerical and janitorial workers of the institution. They had been reduced to a marginal existence because of the effects of the cuts on their already depressed wages. Lower salaries for this force meant greater temptation toward accepting other employment. Their leaving would have meant less ability to maintain the type and quality of maintenance and service the institution needed.

Garrison was able to restore these cuts early in his administration through saving on other projects sponsored by the college.[3] Further increases, though small, were sought and granted during the war years. The administration wrote the Wage Stabilization Office in Atlanta, Georgia, seeking permission to raise wages and was told that the law did not cover these people. Hence, any raises were made without recourse to the government agency and could be made when the institution considered increases feasible.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to C. J. Lively, August 18, 1944, Garrison Papers.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1946, Garrison Papers.

[3] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, p. 23, Garrison Papers.

Business Office Procedures

The president desired that all business management be coordinated through his office. He believed that this was a necessity because of the uncertainty of the times and of the obligation to balance the budget. The problems he faced in accomplishing this and their solutions follow.

Indebtedness and bills

By 1937 an indebtedness of nearly $69,000.00 had been incurred, $19,000.00 of which was owed by the Demonstration School.[1] Part of this was in the form of notes and the rest was in bills. Peabody's practice had been to purchase supplies during the last quarter of the year with the understanding that invoices honored would be paid the next year. This meant that monies budgeted for some items were depleted by the end of the year and no allocations were forthcoming. Because of the confusion, many bills were not paid.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

Policy was established to allow the purchase of items only when cash was on hand and to require the making of payments promptly. By the end of 1937 the policies were functioning efficiently; however, many bills had been outstanding for some time. The last was paid in March of 1941 and was eight years old.[1]

The indebtedness of the Demonstration School was cared for by a simple bookkeeping maneuver.[2] Money had been borrowed from the endowment to pay the indebtedness at a previous time. The trustees approved a measure that would take money from the operating expenses and pay the endowment its due.

Collection of loans

Because of the manner in which student loans were granted and in which they were administered, there grew up a large backlog of unpaid loans. This situation had existed for a decade before Garrison's administration and much money had been lost.[1] Attempts to collect the money due the college met with some success, but the debt was not reduced. The Board put pressure on the debtors by adopting a resolution that no degree would be granted until the debt of a graduate had been paid.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid*.

[2] Executive Committee Minutes, January 27, 1939, p. 476.

Parents had been allowed to endorse the notes of their children in order to get their credits released from the registrar.[3] The college entirely stopped taking temporary notes because they found it almost impossible to collect them. The short-term note was intended to be for a quarter's duration. Students, however, rarely admitted understanding the procedure of the college keeping their grades until their debts were paid.

Garrison tried to impress on debtors the importance of returning the amount owed by stating that no one could borrow from the fund if money loaned were not repaid. Interest was added to pay for administrative costs such as handling, postage, and writing letters. He maintained that no institution could operate for long if it did not look after its finances.[1] He insisted that an effort would be made to collect all funds owed the college.

---

[1] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, pp. 20-21, Garrison Papers.

[2] Board Minutes, May 8, 1941.

[3] Letter from S. C. Garrison to T. C. Young, December 26, 1939, Garrison Papers.

[4] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Lilian Reeves, January 16, 1940, Garrison Papers.

In an effort to bring the financial books into balance, the trustees took the following action:

> RESOLVED, That the president of the college be authorized to charge off non-collectible items of the present corpus of the Loan Fund account each year, up to the amount of income available from the fund until the present corpus has a sound value of $100,000, exclusive of future gifts to the fund.[2]

Administrative costs

In his 1940 report to the Board of Trustees the president states that the administration of the school had been too costly. In 1938 he had reduced the amount spent for this budget item by $29,000.00 over the previous year.[3] To effect such reductions permanently and to guarantee continued efficiency, he advocated shifting personnel to his office. However, he did not prefer to be involved with details of their work, reasoning that the president should have time to deal with students and to make contacts for the college in educational and financial circles.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to D. M. Williams, August 14, 1939, Garrison Papers.

[2] Board Minutes, May 8, 1941.

[3] Annual Report, May 11, 1939, p. 22, Garrison Papers.

He considered as essential to the effective functioning of his office a financial secretary who would make cost studies and watch purchases.[1] He stated a need for a secretary for the mailing services, a private secretary, a scholarship and loan officer, and a publications secretary. Through these personnel, together with the bursar, and the alumni secretary, the noninstructional aspects of the college would be supervised.

Abolition of the office of business manager

In May of 1941 the Board passed a resolution giving the Executive Committee the authority to place the offices of the bursar and the business manager under the direct supervision of the president.[2] The bursar, under Garrison's supervision, later assumed one of the responsibilities of his office called for under the bylaws of the charter, namely, the collection of money owed the college. Collections rose to a near 100 per cent level, whereas in previous years many bills for room rent and tuition had remained unpaid and eventually were lost to the college.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., May 8, 1941, pp. 21-22.

[2] Board Minutes, May 8, 1941.

At the same meeting a statement was adopted relative to the abolition or consolidation of offices.

> RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee is hereby authorized, in case the income of the college decreases because of current conditions, to revise downward the budget as proposed by the president and to effect such reorganization of functions and offices, consolidating and abolishing where it seems wise so as to reduce expenses and yet in such a way as to make a minimum impairment of the educational program.[2]

A year later the Executive Committee abolished the office of business manager.[3] Garrison thought that this was essential to the reorganization of business procedures.[4] He gave the impression of thinking of the business manager's work as being like a fifth wheel.[5] The office was considered an unnecessary expenditure.[6] The name of the business manager was not carried in the list of Officers of Administration in the 1942 edition of the annual catalog which came out the same month the office was abolished. There is indication that a strong personal antagonism existed between the president and the business manager and that there was a concerted drive to force the business manager from his position.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, pp. 21-22, Garrison Papers.

[2] Board Minutes, May 8, 1941.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, April 10, 1942.

[4] Wolfe, interview.

[5] Interview with John E. Brewton, June 29, 1967.

[6] Stokes, interview.

The elimination of the office of business manager meant that officially the president's office controlled all the business operations of the college, including the crucial matter of purchasing. This put an unusually high concentration of major duties and details in the president's office.[2] By 1940 progress had been made in purchasing arrangements, but they were not viewed as being satisfactory because Garrison was convinced that items could be purchased cheaper. Authority was granted in 1942 to the persons using the materials to guide their own purchasing.

One important item was that of publications. Garrison personally revised the handling of this part of the budget.

> You will notice an item of about $8,000 in the budget for publications. This item was formerly $13,500. We have doubled the number of publications and we have

---

[1] Annual Report, May 9, 1946, Garrison papers.

[2] Windrow, interview.

> improved the quality of them; yet we have decreased the cost by $5,500.[1]

This was accomplished by placing the responsibility of taking bids in the hands of the person who got out the publication. The resultant savings enabled the administration to restore the salary cuts of the campus clerical workers and janitorial aides.

Monetary control

For better management and control of the college's finances, certain actions were taken by the Board. The Executive Committee ruled that money transferred to contingent funds could be used only with their authority.[2] Bonds were required of all employees, including the president, bursar, and the treasurer.[3] A system of countersigning had been begun with the bursar and the business manager being required to sign all checks. Authority was then given to the assistant treasurer to sign checks in the absence of the bursar.[4] Further, a motion was passed that an investigation be made of the accounting procedures utilized by the school.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, p. 21, Garrison Papers.

[2] Executive Committee Minutes, July 14, 1939, p. 496.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, June 25, 1940, p. 544.

[4] *Ibid*., March 8, 1943.

Buildings and Grounds

During the years after the stock market crash there was not enough money in the institutional budget allocated to the maintenance department for minimal upkeep of buildings and grounds, for equipment, and for additions to the physical plant. The administration set itself to correct problems that had arisen with relation to these matters.

Maintenance

Some buildings remained unpainted from the time of their construction. Residence halls and classrooms were in need of cleaning. Stone copings on buildings needed inspection and waterproofing, and weatherstripping was almost non-existent. Shades were needed, and lighting in many of the buildings was inadequate, especially in the library and in many basement classrooms.[2]

Extra-heavy expenditures were necessary to combat these conditions. Repainting was completed in all buildings and more powerful lamps were installed to increase foot candle power to minimum standards. The campus was rewired and put on one electrical meter, thus saving about $6,000.00 yearly on the previous system which had been advocated and installed by the Nashville Electric Company.[1]

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 7, 1942.

[2] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, pp. 25-26, Garrison Papers.

Maintenance increased in cost from an average of nearly $65,000.00 from 1930 through 1936 to an average of just over $98,000.00, when expenses for the physical plant and dormitories were combined.[2] Heavy spending was necessitated in order to reroof one building, repair roofs on others, and in some cases refinish floors. Garrison's solution was preventive maintenance, but first the plant had to be restored to a minimum standard.

All painting and repairing of classroom buildings was completed by 1941. The school looked forward to reducing the annual maintenance budget by $20,000.00 after 1943.[3] Budget accounts reveal that this hope was not realized. The need existed in 1945 for major expenditures to restore the plant and grounds to their best condition. Though the plant was one of "unusual beauty," it had been impaired in appearance by war restrictions.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 26.

[2] Treasurer's Reports, 1937-45.

[3] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, p. 27, Garrison Papers.

Equipment

For many years the college was in need of equipment for laboratories. Many high schools and most colleges surpassed Peabody in the equipment made available to students. This was especially true of the Home Economics Department, the Chemistry Department, and the Industrial Arts Department of the Fine Arts Division. Much of what was in the laboratories was homemade. In many places there was "not the necessary equipment to do superior work."[2]

It became necessary to re-equip some areas and to begin to equip others. Supplies in the Music Department were almost non-existent. This meant increasing the amount of money budgeted for equipment, but large outlays were spread over the years to offset budgeting difficulties. The head of the Division of Music made the following statement:

> I found the equipment in very bad shape. What they called pianos I called worthless. You couldn't give a recital on one of them. But I'll have to credit

---

[1] *Ibid*., May 9, 1946.

[2] Garrison to Mikell, March 26, 1941, Garrison Papers.

> Dr. Garrison with this: he provided $15,000.00 for us to get band and orchestra instruments that enabled us to start courses in this field, including some very fine pianos.[1]

The diversion of funds to equipment was not just for the expansion of these departments. The Industrial Arts Department needed to be expanded because of the increased call for teachers in this area; the Music Department needed equipment to meet minimum standards. To get additional help beyond this in order to become more influential in the region was also in the plans of those teaching music.

Equipment was purchased also for other departments. The Modern Language Laboratory and the Reading Clinic Laboratory were the recipients of the next round of increases. Business Education was aided through the purchase of modern office training machines. Lack of space, however, curtailed plans for additional supplies for the Home Economics Department and the Industrial Arts Department. The money spent totaled between $62,000.00 and $75,000.00 for the period between 1937-40; after 1941 annual expenditures were cut to about $5,000.00 for equipment.[2]

If library books can be conceived of as equipment, then the library was the recipient of some increases during this time. Beginning in 1937 allocations were increased by $8,500.00 over the previous year and included funds for salaries, books, and periodical holdings. Valuable additions to the library holdings were received from the Peabody Journal of Education, McGavock Dickinson, Mrs. Fletcher Bascom Dresslar (writings in mental hygiene and genetics), Joseph Peterson (volumes on experimental psychology and sound), and Garrison (books on statistics and educational psychology).[1]

---

[1] Wolfe, interview.

[2] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, pp. 27-29, Garrison Papers.

The above accomplishments reflected Garrison's contention about the necessity for Peabody to retain its educational leadership.

> An institution such as Peabody which is supposed to furnish educational leadership to the South and the nation cannot afford to operate with laboratories, and buildings, and library resources which are inadequate.[2]

Additions to the physical plant

In a speech on May 11, 1939, to the Board Garrison outlined the need for five new buildings, maintaining that a superior program was related to their completion. In order of priority these were a dining hall and student center, a graduate school building, a music building, an auditorium, and additional graduate housing.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[2] Annual Report, May 11, 1939, pp. 10-12, Garrison Papers.

The dining hall and student center would serve to care for large conferences, alumni, and student groups, and would provide space for banquets. It would also be a factor in raising the morale of students.

The graduate building would be a classroom and service edifice. Housed in it would be the graduate offices, the Interstate School Building Service, the Division of Surveys and Field Studies, the Curriculum Laboratory, and the Bureau of International Correspondence. Space for statistical and research equipment would be included.

The music building would house the Music Department, and classes in speech, dramatics, and applied arts. Space made available in the Social-Religious Building by moving the music classes would be allocated to clubs and organizations. The auditorium, separate from this building, would seat between two and three thousand people. Space would be allocated for art exhibits, theater productions, and classrooms.

---

[1] Ibid.

Garrison advocated financing the dormitory for married students out of endowment funds. He was guided in this recommendation by the performance of Peabody's four residence halls, which were the best income-producing property belonging to the institution. While they were not classified as endowment, they yielded more income than endowment investments. It was possible to maintain the residences and have an income of 4 per cent from the investment.[1]

In this report Garrison also advocated having a building known as the primary unit of the Demonstration School. It would house the nursery school and kindergarten. The new unit would be inexpensive but educationally functional.

Certain instructional workshops to be located outside the regular buildings were also mentioned. They were not to be expensive, and each would consist mainly of walls, a roof, and a foundation. These were to be used by departments needing room for projects, practicing, and other activities demanding freedom of movement or where a good deal of noise was involved. Equipment for departments using these units would also be needed.

---

[1] Garrison to Pigford, November 24, 1944, Garrison Papers.

The total cost of the projected buildings would amount to over $1,100,000.00. In response to the president's pleas, the Board authorized the construction of a classroom building to be built as soon as feasible at a cost of $140,000.00.[1] They also approved the construction of a combination nursery and kindergarten building.

Garrison felt that the addition of the buildings he proposed would be instrumental in successfully cementing the future of Peabody.

> The possibilities of Peabody are unlimited. It is the only institution of its kind which has almost absolute freedom to develop the best program in teacher education which it can conceive. In fact, it is almost the only institution in the world with such freedom to go ahead and try to develop a program free from all restraint.[2]

The kindergarten building proved to be the only building constructed. Its cost amounted to $25,000.00. War conditions prohibited the releasing of large amounts of steel and other vital materials to institutions for structures. However small in comparison with other needed buildings, the kindergarten-nursery unit met a need for a place where students could learn to be teachers.

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 9, 1940, p. 527.

[2] Garrison to Pigford, November 24, 1944, Garrison Papers.

The construction of a new power plant was delayed for the duration of the hostilities. The location of the old one was unsatisfactory and its operating expenses costly. Reserves were set aside for a new plant and equipment for use after the war. Garrison realized that this had to be delayed, but he expressed regret that the classroom building was not constructed when the funds were allocated before the war.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*.

CHAPTER III

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE FACULTY

A study of fifty-seven institutions in the North Central Association revealed that institutional excellence "is dependent largely upon a competent, well-organized faculty, which is provided with a satisfactory working environment."[1]

> Individual members must be adequately trained, sufficiently experienced in their specialties, and must evidence their scholarship through publication and by participation in learned societies. Effective faculty organization means a well-balanced ratio between student numbers and instructional staff, an adequate representation in the various fields of instruction, and ample opportunity for staff participation in policy making. Good working conditions means that satisfactory provision must be made for the following: "salary status; tenure; instructional load; recruiting, selection, and appointment; aids to faculty growth; and provisions for leaves of absence, retirement, insurance, housing, and recreation and community life."[2]

The Peabody faculty of the 1937-45 era has not been studied fully in the manner described above. This chapter will identify and discuss only the two major problems cited by Garrison that had reference to the teaching personnel. First, however, some general information about the group will be presented.

---

[1] Logan Wilson, The Academic Man (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1964), p. 158.

[2] Ibid.

A Profile of the Faculty

A total of 347 different names was recorded in the catalogs of the college under the heading "Faculty."[1] The term "Faculty" refers only to those employed by the college for instructional purposes. It includes those teachers in the Demonstration School who also taught courses in the college. The yearly number ranged from a high of 153 in 1941 to a low of 109 in 1944. The average list contained the names of 128 people. (See Table 6.)

Highest Earned Degree

By the name of every person on the "Faculty" list was the designation of the highest degree that person had earned. In an average year, the faculty consisted of fifty-one people with the doctorate, or 40.4 per cent; fifty-seven with the master's degree, or 44.7 per cent; thirteen with the bachelor's, or 9.9 per cent; six with no degree, or 4.6 per cent; and less than one with the R.N., or 0.4 per cent.

---

[1] Bulletin, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

TABLE 6

HIGHEST DEGREES HELD YEARLY BY PEABODY FACULTY BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE, 1937-1945[a]

	NUMBER						PERCENTAGE					
	D[b]	M[c]	B[d]	N[e]	RN[f]	Total	D	M	B	N	RN	Total
1937	58	54	14	5	2	133	43.6	40.6	10.5	3.7	1.6	100.0
1938	50	58	12	8	1	129	38.8	44.9	9.3	6.2	.8	100.0
1939	50	64	14	11	1	140	35.7	45.7	10.0	7.9	.7	100.0
1940	57	58	17	11	0	143	39.9	40.5	11.9	7.7		100.0
1941	59	64	20	10	0	153	38.6	41.8	13.1	6.5		100.0
1942	50	50	16	5	0	121	41.4	41.3	13.2	4.1		100.0
1943	47	52	8	3	0	110	42.7	47.3	7.3	2.7		100.0
1944	44	54	8	2	1	109	40.3	50.5	7.3	1.8	.1	100.0
1945	48	56	7	1	0	112	42.8	50.0	6.2	.9		100.0
Average Yearly	51.5	56.7	12.9	6.2	.5	128	40.4	44.7	9.9	4.6	.4	100.0

[a] Source: *Bulletin*, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

[b] D = Doctorate [c] M = Master [d] B = Bachelor [e] N = None [f] RN = Registered Nurse

Over the nine-year span, of the 347 individuals, doctorates were held by 102, or 29.4 per cent; the master's degree by 153, or 44.1 per cent; and the bachelor's by sixty-one, or 17.6 per cent. (See Table 7.) Those with the R.N. totaled three, or 0.8 per cent, and those with no degree amounted to twenty-eight, or 8.1 per cent. Of the twenty-eight, fourteen taught in the field of music; the rest were in one of the following areas: arts, English, fine arts, nursing education, and physical education.

Members of the faculty held four kinds of doctoral degrees: The Doctor of Philosophy, the Doctor of Theology, the Doctor of Medicine, and the Doctor of Music. There were none who held the Doctor of Education degree. Of the 102 holders of earned doctoral degrees ninety-seven held the Ph.D. degree. The number of doctorates reached its highest peak in 1941 when fifty-nine faculty members held that type of degree. This diminished to a low of forty-four in 1944. Only in 1937 did the doctorate exceed in number the next highest earned degree; in 1942 there was an equal number of doctorate and master's degree holders.

Four kinds of master's degrees had been earned by the faculty: the Master of Arts, the Master of Science, the Master of Music, and the Master of Arts in Education.

TABLE 7

TOTAL AND PERCENTAGE OF HIGHEST DEGREES HELD BY FACULTY MEMBERS, 1937-1945[a]

Degree Title	Total	Percentage
Doctorates	102	29.4
Masters	153	44.1
Bachelors	61	17.6
Registered Nurses	3	0.8
No degree	28	8.1
	347	100.0

[a]Source: Bulletin, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

There were four and one-half times more Master of Arts degrees earned than all other master's degrees combined. In both 1939 and 1941 there were sixty-four faculty members whose highest earned degree was the master's. There was a drop to fifty in 1942, but a gradual rise was experienced through 1945. The number of those who held the master's degree surpassed those who held the doctorate in every year except 1937 and 1942. The number also surpassed, by more than four times, those who held the bachelor's degree.

There were five kinds of bachelor's degrees held by members of the faculty: the Bachelor of Arts, the Bachelor of Science, the Bachelor of Music, the Bachelor of Sacred Music, and the Bachelor of Philosophy. From a peak of twenty in 1941 the number who held this type of degree decreased to seven by 1945.

There was at least one person on the instructional faculty with the title Registered Nurse in the years 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1944. The number of faculty members without at least one academic degree increased in the late thirties but diminished from 1941 through 1945. The highest number employed at any one time was eleven in 1940, but by 1945 the total was cut to one.

Professional Rank

Four ranks were utilized for classification purposes, namely, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. (See Table 8.)

Of the 347 faculty members listed in the catalogs, fifty-nine were ranked as Professor. This comprised 17 per cent of the total. The greatest number (forty-nine, or 83 per cent) of those of this rank held the doctorate. Seven (12 per cent) with the master's degree, two (3 per cent) with the bachelor's degree, and one (2 per cent) with no degree also held this rank. The latter was a well-known Professor of Art.

The title, Associate Professor, was given to twenty of the faculty. This category contained the lowest portion of the total, 5.8 per cent. Of those with this rank, eight (40 per cent) held the doctorate, eleven (55 per cent) the master's degree, and one (5 per cent) the bachelor's degree.

There were twenty-six who held the title Assistant Professor, and they comprised 7.5 per cent of the group. Most of those (twenty-one, or 81 per cent) held the master's degree. Only one had earned the doctorate, and four (15 per cent) had gained the bachelor's degree.

TABLE 8

ACADEMIC RANK OF FACULTY BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE, 1937-1945, WHERE N=347, AND WHERE N=154[a]

Rank	Number, N=347	Percentage
Professor	59	17.0
Associate Professor	20	5.8
Assistant Professor	26	7.5
Instructor	49	14.1
No Rank	193	55.6
	347	100.0

Rank	Number, N=154[b]	Percentage
Professor	59	38.3
Associate Professor	20	12.9
Assistant Professor	26	16.9
Instructor	49	31.9
	154	100.0

[a] Source: Bulletin, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

[b] Excludes those with no rank.

The third largest group, those with the title Instructor, totaled forty-nine. It covered 14.1 per cent of the faculty. This rank was held by thirty-five (72 per cent) who held the master's degree, two (4 per cent) who had earned the doctorate, ten (20 per cent) whose highest degree was the bachelor's, and by two (4 per cent) who had been awarded the nursing diploma.

The largest group, 193, had no professional rank. This situation prevailed because most of the number were faculty who taught for brief periods of time. The divisions with the largest numbers of non-ranking faculty were Music (forty-nine), Education (twenty-six), Social Science (twenty-four), and Library Science (seventeen). Of the total number, thirty-three (17 per cent) held the doctorate, eighty-three (43 per cent) the master's degree, forty-eight (25 per cent) the bachelor's degree, and one (1 per cent) the nursing diploma. Twenty-eight (14 per cent) had no degree.

When those with no ranking were eliminated from consideration, those with the rank of Professor (fifty-nine) comprised 38.3 per cent of the new total of 154. Those ranked as Associate Professor (twenty) amounted to 12.9 per cent; and those known as Instructor (forty-nine), 31.9 per cent. (See Table 8.)

Visibility

Many of the Peabody College faculty were prominent in organizations of national significance. Some were noted because of their participation in activities related to their interests.

Organizational service

Faculty members served in the position of president for the following organizations: the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, the Rural Department of the National Education Association, the Southern Division of the American Nurses' Association, the Southern Classical Association, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Kappa Gamma, the National Council on Social Studies, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Association for Research in Science Teaching. One was vice-president of the American Classical League; another was vice-president of the American Dietetic Association. One had served as past president of the National Association of Geography Teachers and of the Association of American Geographers.[1]

---

[1] Summarized from the Peabody Reflector and Alumni News, X-XVIII (1937-45).

The college furnished secretaries for the men's athletic section of the American Association of Health and Physical Education Research and for the Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing. Faculty members served as secretary-treasurers for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, the National Board of the Association for Childhood Education, and the Society for the Central South of the American Dialect Society.

Some Peabody educators served as directors for the National Council of Teachers of English, the Horace Mann League, the Fifth Congressional District of the National Education Association, the Association of College and Reference Librarians, the American Science Teachers Association, the American Nurses Association, and the Southern Division of the American Nurses Association.

Publications

Members of the faculty of the college were active in producing articles and books for publication. Each year the president's report to the Board included a section recording their accomplishments.

During this nine-year period, fifty-four men and women of the faculty wrote 436 articles for an average of eight per author.[1] These appeared in almost 150 different periodicals for an average of three for each publication. However, most publications contained only one article each. Over 100 articles were contributed to the Peabody Reflector and Alumni News, and over fifty to the Peabody Journal of Education. The Nation's Schools and the Review of Educational Research each published eight articles. A smaller number appeared in the Southern Association Quarterly and the School Executive.

Manuscripts were published in periodicals related to the fields of education, such as administration, curriculum, school law, research, the elementary school, and secondary education. Some were printed in periodicals related to fields of study other than education: business, sociology, psychology, biology, botany, geography, chemistry, mathematics, home economics, health, agriculture, and English.

Others appeared in the NEA Journal and related state National Education Association organizational publications. Some were contributed to periodicals of fraternal groups, among them being The Educational Forum (Kappa Delta Pi) and the Phi Delta Kappan (Phi Delta Kappa).

---

[1] Annual Reports, 1937-45, Garrison Papers.

Articles were included in the proceedings of the Texas College Association, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing, and the National Association of Penmanship Teaching and Supervision. Others appeared in the yearbooks of the American Association of Teachers of Education, the Department of Supervision and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association, and the National Business Teachers Association.

Nineteen faculty members were listed as authors of books, bulletins, or unpublished, but mimeographed works. Their major subject was education, including curriculum, school administration, teaching personnel, maintenance, and reading. Other subjects dealt with were geography, history, languages, mathematics, science, and psychology. Many of the publications were workbooks or manuals; several books were parts of series. Several writings were the result of investigations conducted by the Division of Surveys and Field Studies.

Other activities

Various members of the teaching staff aided local, regional, and national organizations, such as the educational associations, by attending and appearing on programs sponsored by these groups. They read papers and made speeches at professional meetings. Some conducted conferences, led workshops, and taught in institutes. Services were rendered to school districts in the form of surveys and consultations. A few of the faculty served as consultants to the government of the United States during the war years in educationally-related services in the Office of Defense, Health, and Welfare.

Non-Instructional Responsibilities

The members of the faculty had two major responsibilities of a non-instructional nature: committee service and faculty meetings.

Committee service

Listed in the catalogs were twenty-eight committees on which faculty members served.[1] (See Table 9.) This list does not include those committees which were appointed by the faculty to serve their own needs. The official committees of the college were appointed by the president and existed for the benefit of the institution at large. While most of the members of the committees were faculty personnel, some were administrative officers, and others were

---

[1] Bulletin, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

TABLE 9

LIST OF COMMITTEES AND CHAIRMEN, 1937, 1940-1945[a]

Committee	1937	1940-1945
Appointment	Windrow	McBride (1940-41), Crabb (1942-45)
College Instruction		Roemer (1942-45)
Correspondence Instruction	Roehm	Roehm
Curriculum and Educational Policies	Crabb	Garrison
Demonstration School		Windrow
Entrance and Credits	Robinson	Robinson
Graduate Instruction		Campbell (1940-41), Robinson (1942) Brewton (1943-44), Jones (1945)
Knapp School of Country Life	Frost	Shaver
Library	Parkins	Crabb
Religious Affairs and Religious Life	Crawford	Crawford
Scholarships and Loans	Sensing	Sensing (1940-41), Crabb (1942-44), Whitaker (1945)
Social	Wren	Wren
Student Life		Leavell (1941-45

[a] Source: Bulletin, XXVI, XXIX-XXIV (1937, 1940-45). List for the years 1938 and 1939 were not published. The above list contains only the names of those committees either retained or added by Garrison.

appointed to represent areas of interest related to the responsibility of the committee.

The committees bore the following names: Appointment, Assignment of Rooms, College Instruction, College of Education, Correspondence Instruction, Curriculum, Curriculum and Educational Policies, Demonstration School, Dormitory Life, Entrance and Credits, Extension, Graduate Instruction, Graduate School of Education, Health and Sanitation, Junior College-Demonstration School, Junior College, Knapp School, Knapp School of Country Life, Library, Loans and Scholarships, Public Exercise, Publications, Religious Work, Religious Affairs and Religious Life, Senior College, Social Activities, Social, and Student Life.

Not all were in existence every year. The following were discontinued by 1940: Assignment of Rooms, College of Education, Extension, Graduate School of Education, Health and Sanitation, Junior College-Demonstration, Public Exercise, and Publications. The Dormitory Life Committee was terminated in 1941 and the Junior College Committee in 1942. Newly-formed committees were the Graduate Instruction Committee and the Senior College Committee (both in 1940), the Student Life Committee (in 1941), and the College Instruction Committee (in 1942).

Some committees were renamed: the Curriculum Committee became the Curriculum and Educational Policies Committee; the Knapp School Committee became the Knapp School of Country Life Committee; the Religious Work Committee became the Religious Affairs and Religious Life Committee; the Loans and Scholarships Committee became the Scholarship and Loans Committee; and the Social Activities Committee became the Social Committee.

In one instance a committee divided into two parts. The Junior College-Demonstration School Committee split to form the Junior College Committee and the Demonstration School Committee. In another instance two committees, the Junior College Committee and the Senior College Committee, were merged to form the College Instruction Committee.

In most instances committees were chaired by personnel whose responsibilities were directly related to the purpose of the committee. (See Table 9.) For instance, the business manager was the chairman of the Assignment of Rooms Committee, the registrar oversaw the Entrance and Credits Committee, and the Dean of the Junior College was the moderator of the Junior College-Demonstration School Committee. During the 1942-45 period there were thirteen committees functioning. Five of these were chaired by persons who were primarily administrative officers, three by one faculty member, and the rest by individual faculty personnel. Of the 347 faculty members, sixty-six were appointed to and served on the twenty-three committees. Each of the sixty-six was on an average of more than five committees.

Faculty meetings

Normally, the faculty meetings were called and conducted by the president, although the faculty did have the privilege through a committee to suggest the time and nature of the meetings. At all such gatherings announcements were made emphasizing such things as enrollment, the Demonstration School, the catalog, commencement speakers, and the importance of watching expenditures.

Debate was enjoined over such things as granting credit for extension courses, the cases of students appealing for credit on courses or for reinstatement, and the establishment of new degrees or the reorganization of others.

> I remember some most heated ones in which various people would disagree. One got almost apoplectic. Another would get very heated and excited. I can't remember about what they got so excited and vehement at times. They didn't hesitate to express their opinions on any subject. One would get especially heated when he talked about raising standards and cutting out people.

> He had a philosophy that everyone should be able to come and be helped as much as they needed. But he was not too concerned about raising standards. He wanted a minimum standard.[1]

In answering a query about the popularity of discussion, Hunt gave the following reply:

> Yes, there were instances. It was quite democratic from the standpoint of faculty discussion. Decisions were made by the central administration and not necessarily by the total faculty participation. I remember discussion on the perennial question about whether or not to have an undergraduate school. There was more heat than light and nothing was done about it. Garrison talked matters over with a good many people but did not often carry matters of importance to an open forum of the faculty for decision . . . decisions (were made) rather quickly and without the full participation of the faculty.[2]

Voting was held periodically to grant degrees to certified candidates for graduation and to elect the recipient of the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award, as well as to act upon motions presented at regular meetings.

Committees appointed by the administration and those appointed solely for faculty purposes reported to the body. In the average meeting two or three of the fourteen committees organized yearly presented matters. The information took the form of recommendations and progress reports.

On occasion the group was advisory in nature. For instance, they were asked to express their opinions concerning institutional activities in order that the effectiveness and future of the activities might be determined.

---

[1] Interview with Louis T. Nicholas, May 12, 1967.

[2] Interview with C. B. Hunt, Jr., May 15, 1967.

Up to August 19, 1939, meetings were held with regularity, but after this they were held infrequently. There were some meetings of only those faculty members who were graduates of Peabody. As in times past, minutes were not distributed. The absence of the minutes in the archives did not necessarily mean the absence of faculty meetings, however. Hunt stated that he thought there was a time when faculty meetings were held with no one taking records of the proceedings.[1]

Faculty Problems and Their Solutions

Diekhoff maintains that there are always staffing problems with institutions emphasizing advanced learning:

> If higher education is a critically important activity, college teaching will continue to be, as it always has been, a critically important profession. When few go to college, few teachers are needed, and the faculty problem is largely one of selection. When many go to college and many more teachers are needed, it is a fourfold problem of recruitment, selection, training, and judicious assignment.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] John S. Diekhoff, The Domain of the Faculty in Our Expanding Colleges (New York: Harper and Bros., 1956), p. 187.

Garrison stated that there were two major problems having reference to the faculty of Peabody: (1) the development of teaching personnel, and (2) the relationship of the faculty to the educational program.

Developing Teaching Personnel

Among the objectives of a college in its personnel policy are the following: (1) gathering as competent a faculty as it can, (2) exploiting by appropriate division of labor the special skills and knowledge of faculty members, and (3) seeking to enhance faculty competence.[1] At Peabody a concerted effort was made to achieve the latter.

The need for a great faculty

In a speech to the members of the Board, Garrison expressed a desire to have a strong faculty at the college.[2] He stated that the faculty problem was the biggest problem facing the institution at that time.[3] He maintained that the developing of teaching personnel was a problem of internal growth and development, and that, if the institution were to produce a high quality of leadership, it must be manned by a superior personnel.[1] He felt that there was a need for building a faculty of distinction because other institutions were looking to Peabody for graduates who would teach or fill administrative positions.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[2] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, pp. 49-51, Garrison Papers.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Generally, the group was considered to be effective in its instructional pursuits. Much of the credit for bringing to the campus several outstanding people that were a part of the faculty was attributed to Bruce Ryburn Payne. Garrison endeavored to continue this practice. However, one evaluation was more qualified:

> From the standpoint of teaching, the two strongest departments were education and psychology, in that order. The other departments were not uniformly strong. There was some excellent instruction in education, mainly the theoretical. . . . The direction of the college was one of innovation but without prior checking to ascertain what direction the educational winds were blowing. Basic education was weak: languages, English, social studies; however, in each of these areas there were some fine teachers.[2]

Although Garrison recognized that scholarship was an imperative in any institution doing a major portion of its work on the graduate level, he was convinced that the faculty at Peabody should possess more than scholarship.

---

[1] _Ibid_., May 11, 1939, p. 6.

[2] Hunt, interview.

> A teachers' college, more than any other type of institution, must have faculty members who possess desirable personal qualities, who have a sane and wholesome point of view toward the traditions and ideals of their country, who have unusual human understanding and sympathy, and who are devoted to the development of a better life in the general population through educative and orderly means.[1]

He did not want Peabody teachers to become a part of what he held to be a generalized view of faculty members in the better schools of America. He perceived not only that the era was a revolutionary one in education, but also that many teachers lived in an idealistic world and were wholly unprepared to meet the new situation.

> In the better colleges in America a faculty member gets into an atmosphere where he feels secure; and he feels that he can do those things that he wants to do. Many times what he wants to do has no relationship to what the community or society needs. From the pragmatic point of view his courses become almost worthless.[2]

Garrison thought that the earning of the graduate degree had become the entrance requirement into a type of guild whose members felt that the educational world owed them positions in which they could do about as they pleased. Furthermore, he contended that the intense study of psychology by the teachers of professional education courses led to movements--among them the child-centered school--which got away from the importance of the social and community aspects of education.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, p. 1, Garrison Papers.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Kendall Weisinger, January 3, 1941, pp. 1-2, Garrison Papers.

The Board also spoke on the need for an outstanding faculty. One of the group, after citing the intent of the founders for the college to graduate students with the best scholarship, offered the following resolution:

> Whereas, the greatest success of Peabody College will follow upon securing a faculty of the highest equipment and character:
>
> Therefore, be it resolved that the trustees have and now advise and direct the president to spare no effort nor reasonable expense to do so at the earliest date and as economically as possible.[2]

They advised using caution in the employment of persons who would be teachers at the college:

> The fact that Peabody has an obligation to set the standards for the region makes it necessary that the educational, moral, and spiritual atmosphere of the college represent the best that there is in our region. For that reason we must be very careful in the selection of faculty members.[3]

Keeping faculty quality at a high level

Garrison endeavored to keep the quality of the faculty at a high level and to improve it by personal admonition, the retention of those faculty members teaching courses and rendering services which were a significant contribution to the institution, the establishment of retirement and annuity plans, the consideration of a tenure provision, and by the creation of a replacement policy.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 438.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, November 22, 1943.

General admonitions

Shortly after the death of Bruce Ryburn Payne, the faculty held a meeting during which Garrison, then Acting President, urged them to keep up the morale of the campus.[1] He assured his listeners that the institution was on a sound financial basis, though there were areas that needed additional money, primarily the library and laboratories. Further, he asked the group to help maintain the integrity of the school as a teacher training institution. One observation of the morale of the faculty was made by an interviewee:

> I guess it was true that those who were active and believed in the enterprise and were accomplishing things, either through the enterprise or on their own, had good morale, and those who weren't didn't. The small group who made up the faculty at that time I recall as a group with pretty good morale. I don't recall any great areas of unhappiness or frustrated dissent. . . . The morale of the faculty depended more or less on the collective individual happiness--the

---

[1] Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty VI, May 12, 1937, 190-91. Cited hereafter as Faculty Minutes.

> satisfaction of the individual faculty member. From that standpoint I would say that the morale was pretty high.[1]

An observation with a different emphasis was made by Hill following his assumption to the presidency:

> The morale of the faculty . . . was not the best. There was some feeling that the great days were gone, that the great teachers had died and had not been replaced, and that Peabody was trailing and not leading as of old. Among the faculty there seemed to be individual plans rather than team plans for Peabody.[2]

In other meetings Garrison admonished them not to be too technical or "wooden" in their approach to students, not to pass students in order to keep up enrollments, and not to pressure them into taking certain classes. Additional counsel was offered:

> Remember to do good teaching; know your students; require good scholarship; have a sympathetic understanding and attitude toward the student's problems.[3]

He cautioned the faculty of the Demonstration School not to overload themselves during the summer with the dual responsibility of teaching and taking courses.[4] He desired the best possible instruction for the Demonstration

---

[1] Hunt, interview.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1946, Garrison Papers.

[3] Faculty Minutes, VI, December 4, 1937, p. 225.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 205.

School population which was much larger in the summer than in the regular school year.

Retention policy

Because the greater portion of the faculty were beyond military age, Peabody did not lose a large number of teachers to the armed forces. This situation was in contrast to that of many institutions whose teachers were younger and whose teaching ranks were depleted by military service commitments. As the enrollment diminished, particularly in the graduate school, the institution retained almost as many professors as when the enrollment was higher. This figure included a large number of women. Garrison and others throughout the United States thought that graduate enrollment might disappear. By 1943 it had already dropped off by 50 per cent. This left Peabody with a lower teacher-student ratio but created serious problems financially.[1]

Because of the financial situation the administration faced the prospect of dropping personnel from both the staff and the faculty. It was decided that their retention would be based on considerations for the future: those fields in which Peabody was strong would be preserved, and those in which the college made little or no contribution, or in which other institutions made a significant contribution, would be reduced in teaching size.[1]

---

[1] Garrison to Pigford, March 7, 1942, pp. 1-2, Garrison Papers.

Establishment of a retirement plan

Another means of keeping the quality of the faculty at a high level was to establish a retirement plan. Garrison mentioned this in his 1938 report to the trustees of the college.[2] Actually, a few years before, the college had entered into an agreement with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America. This nationwide organization was set up by the Carnegie Corporation to provide for the retirement of college teachers and certain other individual educational workers. By 1938 no one at Peabody had retired under this plan which provided funds at age sixty-five. The plan was voluntary, and some did not choose to enter it.

The president made the following plea:

> Retirement at most institutions becomes automatic at sixty-five. In the case of certain needed professors when the administration sees fit, retirement may be postponed a year or so, usually to sixty-eight. We have a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

[2] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 51, Garrison Papers.

> number of persons approaching these ages and it is highly important that some definite policy be formulated.[1]

Garrison wanted the plan to go into effect because of certain situations that existed to the detriment of the college:

> We have on our campus one or two situations which are not good. Unless certain retirements can be effected in several departments, we shall simply sit here for the next decade, working diligently with limited funds trying to hold the program together, while we provide positions for professors who have lost interest.[2]

He favored retirement at sixty-five with the stipulation that the president be given the option to employ from year to year to the age of sixty-eight those whose services were needed and who were effective teachers. He also asked for a clause in the retirement policy which would enable the administration to retire some professors who were not yet sixty-five. He feared that a few nearing sixty-five had virtually retired on full pay, and he urged that some means be brought to bear so that the institution would get full service for the monies it paid in salaries.[3]

The Board responded by offering a resolution to authorize the Executive Committee to study the question of retirement and to work out a retirement policy to be presented for adoption at an annual meeting.[1] Two years later the Board passed a resolution that the faculty of the college be retired at age sixty-five beginning in the year 1941.[2] The president was given permission to extend contracts yearly up to the age of seventy. Later, the Executive Committee reviewed the retirement plan without taking formal action to modify it.[3]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., pp. 51-52.

[3] Ibid., p. 52.

Garrison saw no one working out a successful method of eliminating poor teachers from institutions. He did foresee the possibility of friction developing in any attempt to retire this type of teacher, but he was willing to face it.[4] He feared that better teachers would be drained from the institution and poor ones would be left. Hence, there was a need for an efficient yet flexible retirement system and a successful elective system.

Revision of the annuity program

The retirement agreement was linked to an annuity plan whereby the college paid an amount equal to 5 per cent of the professor's salary and which was matched by an equal amount from the professor. Earlier, the faculty had been given the opportunity to participate in a similar plan, but one or two had been advised not to do so because of their ages.

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 438.

[2] _Ibid_., May 9, 1940, p. 525.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, August 20, 1942.

[4] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 53, Garrison Papers.

> . . . In Dr. Little's case, because he was approximately fifty-five at the time the college entered into this plan, President Payne, I understand, advised him not to participate in that his age was too great, and for that reason the annuity would amount to a rather small sum in his case.[1]

Others had not entered the plan and were either approaching the age of retirement or had passed it. On behalf of these Garrison suggested that the Board either pay to them in a lump sum an amount equal to what would have been paid into the annuity plan or purchase an annuity for them.[2]

Interviewees cited many interesting things about the annuity plan. One trustee stated that everyone employed by the college was eligible for it.[3] However, one staff member stated that she did not get into the plan until several years after her employment because she did not know of its availability. Others given the title "executive secretary" were eligible upon employment.[1] Garrison was trying to formulate a plan for the participation of all secretarial personnel, though.

---

[1] Garrison to Mikell, March 28, 1940, Garrison Papers.

[2] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 52, Garrison Papers.

[3] Stokes, interview.

One faculty member made the following statement:

> Dr. Garrison and all others were slow to put people on annuity. It was offered, but you did not have to take it. There was probably a lack of communication among the offices of the president, business office, and the bursar.[2]

Another faculty member revealed that he did not enter the plan until three years after he came to Peabody.[3] One person attributed Garrison's reluctance to the fact that it was a time when the institution was hard-pressed financially, and the president did not want to put money into a person when the possibility existed that he was not going to stay with the institution.

Inauguration of a tenure policy

Another means of keeping up the quality of the faculty was through adopting a tenure policy. There was no such policy at Peabody in 1938. Garrison told the Board what the tenure practices were at some of the better institutions in the nation. He commented on Peabody's practice of selecting teaching personnel.

---

[1] Interview with Margaret Pritchett, May 15, 1967.

[2] Southall, interview.

[3] Interview with A. L. Crabb, May 24, 1967.

[4] Wolfe, interview.

> At Peabody the practice has been to elect a professor to the faculty, and then he is on the payroll indefinitely. This has some advantages. Individuals frequently, in the course of years, change radically. Men who are very promising early in life sometimes decline rapidly, having reached their maximum growth early. Other promising men feel secure and do not attempt to adjust themselves to the needs of the institution, taking somewhat the attitude that they hold the same relationship to their positions that they hold to a piece of property.[1]

Garrison also stated a policy which he had set in operation concerning the selection of teaching personnel.

> We must not put people on our faculty because they want positions or because they are good men. People must be put on the faculty only because there is an educational job to be done, and the individual selected must be considered the best man available. Faculty members must be employed solely on the basis that they are needed and contribute to our educational program. We must not make places for people at Peabody, but we must find people for the places.[2]

The Board responded by giving the Executive Committee the power to act on the formulation of a standard tenure policy for new members of the faculty as to terms of years and the renewal of contracts.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 52, Garrison Papers.

[2] Ibid., p. 58.

Replacement practice

The president also adopted a policy of not replacing all of the faculty who had gone to other institutions, had been called into the services, had retired or were facing retirement, or had died. This was done because of the uncertainty of the economic situation and because Garrison believed that his next big job at Peabody was to find more outstanding persons and some younger teachers who would become scholars in their fields.[2]

Despite this action there was not much change in the previous practices. Incoming teachers were not given written contracts: the only contract was the letter informing the individual of the appointment that had been made to the faculty. Tenure was not discussed; teachers were not notified that they were on tenure even if they had been at the college for several years.

The faculty did enjoy security, however.

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 438.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to T. H. Napier, February 29, 1944, Garrison Papers.

> This is a peculiar arrangement. Not so many of the matters that related to the faculty were formalized into stated and circulated policy. . . . I must say that in its operation I never saw an institution in which a faculty member had as much security as he did while I was here. . . . I didn't receive any written contract . . . but I must say that I experienced no interference, no dictation, no feeling of insecurity from that day to the day I left. . . . I told somebody that I felt that I did not know of any institutions, even those with elaborate statements of tenure, whose faculty members were more secure than were those at Peabody. It was not that kind of institution where policies were written out in great detail and communicated to everybody.[1]

The president received some criticism for allowing vacancies to accumulate, but he also received support from others who saw the situation at first-hand.

> Actually, there was a period of time when there was no need to replace faculty members that were lost. . . . Toward the last, Garrison was interested in building up a financial reserve. He was very conservative. When a person dropped out whom he did not have to replace, he did not replace him. There was a feeling on the part of the faculty that a person should be replaced; but there was the question of whether or not you should replace one when there were no students. Then there was the idea that if you had no teachers you could have no students. He took the position that he tried to conserve as much as possible.[2]

Again,

> He was aware of the downward trend in enrollment and also of the uncertainty of the war effort. Only those who have gone through the war could understand how difficult it was to plan ahead with any degree of certainty. No one knew how long it was going to last.

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

[2] Brewton, interview.

> Winning the war to Garrison was the important thing. Holding the college together was his responsibility.[1]

Further,

> The faculty was very stable, but soon after, in the 1940's, with tensions developing, we experienced several resignations from the faculty. When the war came there was an exodus of the younger men going from the campus--Shores, Shane, and a number of others. Dr. Garrison did not replace these. He was a psychologist, a research man--his whole life was committed to Peabody. When a psychologist went into the Army, he was not replaced. The psychology department almost disappeared. . . . He was a very conservative man, and he tightened up on spending. Along with the economics in the administration, plus the resignations, the college financially became stronger. Garrison probably ended up his administration more in the black than had been expected.[2]

In late 1945, despite the decline in numbers, the faculty still retained a measure of its prestige:

> . . . a faculty which even after great losses still contained some distinguished men and women, those known for scholarship, leadership, and devotion to the cause of education and to Peabody College.[3]

As the enrollment of the college began to increase toward the end of the war and relief from the financial bind was in sight, the president began to recruit actively. Eighteen replacements were needed. He wondered where he would find them.

---

[1] Wolfe, interview.

[2] Windrow, interview.

[3] Annual Report, May 9, 1946, Garrison Papers.

> Even before the war, it was difficult to find that rare personality who makes a great college teacher--a scholar, a well-rounded man, stable, and with intellectual, moral, and spiritual leadership. Of all institutions, colleges should exert the most favorable, far-reaching influence on civilization. They can do so only if manned by the best human products of the age. Where is this leadership being trained today?[1]

His successor shared in this task:

> . . . Because of the late president's illness, the war upsets and uncertainties, and the Acting President's obligation not to set final policies, there were many personnel problems left to be settled at a time when fine men and women were hardest to obtain.[2]

Relationship of the Faculty to the Educational Program

Garrison stated that no one had ever devised a method of keeping a faculty vitalized and actively interested in an educational program.[3] He also said that the faculty of Peabody was characterized by being a loosely organized group which was not always able to see the purpose of the college.[4]

The faculty was known for its individualism.

---

[1] S. C. Garrison, "The President's Page," The Peabody Reflector, XVII (March, 1944), 83.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1946, Garrison Papers.

[3] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 58, Garrison Papers.

[4] Garrison to Mikell, March 24, 1938, p. 1, Garrison Papers.

> The professor did as he pleased. Everyone. The head of the division sometimes said something about the way things should be done, but the professor was not bothered. He did everything he wanted to. There was as little administrative interference with the faculty as in any place I have ever known.[1]

Others agreed with this position.

> That has been true of Peabody throughout its history. There have been nationally known people in many departments. The administration has been pretty flexible with the faculty. We have not been a rubber stamp. The faculty were given freedom in determining the college curriculum.[2]

Garrison contended that development of the school's educational program was affected by the personnel problem.

> At Peabody, personnel is our most serious problem in the development of a program. We must hold to the philosophy that there are no vested interests at this institution. Our activities and our connection with this institution are for the purpose of bettering educational conditions throughout our region. We particularly want to emphasize the personnel problem of the College, because we believe that it is more serious here than it is at any other institution of similar size or of like character.[3]

He wanted the faculty to know his motive for needing their support.

> We have only one thing in mind. We all know for what this institution was established. Someone who loved this region gave money for a program which he thought would best serve this region. Someone had a

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

[2] Southall, interview.

[3] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, Garrison Papers.

> vision of what the education of this region could do to society. This institution has always stood as an instrument to put into practice the ideas of what education can do to civilization. The type of education we give this region has much to do with the type of civilization it will have. Peabody College is the most important institution in the entire region in determining the type of civilization we will have. We get closer to the people of the region we serve than does any other institution in America.[1]

He saw the necessity of the faculty being united in order for the institution to fulfill the mission before it.

Support for the program

The president asked each member of the faculty to feel that he or she was a part of the program and to build on what had already been done. He exhorted them to find out what the mission of Peabody was and to assist in effecting that mission.[2] He wanted to reorganize them so as to fulfill the mission of the college, believing that the college existed for the good of the people to be taught, not for the faculty, administration, or trustees.[3]

In Garrison's point of view there were two types of services rendered by the faculty: those from which the college derived income and those from which it did not. The latter services were of great importance to the economic and social development of the region, but they were not to be supported by tuition.

---

[1] Faculty Minutes, VI, May 12, 1937, p. 210.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, Garrison Papers.

Included in these non-academic services were the following: a program of dual education through which the college endeavored to give advice and counsel to Negro institutions; a school building service which furnished consultative services, plans, and bulletins for school buildings, grounds, and equipment; publications, results of research conducted by professors and their assistants; religious activities that would result in human betterment and a clearer understanding of the common unities "which the fatherhood of God implies"; and the Bureau of International Correspondence which was designed to promote a better understanding between young people of the United States and foreign countries.[1]

He planned to strengthen these services by adding to the faculty.

> The addition of new professors in these fields would definitely increase the service of the college so that it would mold to an even greater degree the curriculum and philosophy of education.
> Additional staff members would enable the college to build a much more effective and enriched program in

---

[1] *Ibid*., May 11, 1939, p. 8.

> those fields in which there is need for greater service.[1]

Garrison stated that progress had been made in involving the faculty more deeply in the educational program of the college through the conducting of a series of faculty meetings during which the program of the institution was discussed as well as the method of expanding help to the schools of the country at large. Upon attending these special meetings, he concluded that the faculty were actively seeking to better the program of the college.[2]

In 1940 he announced that there had been a measureable amount of internal improvement in the area of faculty development. He believed, however, that a good many teachers were still at Peabody who had little idea of what the program was and how a teachers' college differed from any other institution, particularly one emphasizing graduate work.[3]

He was strengthened by the feeling that they had accepted his leadership:

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Garrison to Mikell, March 14, 1938, p. 1, Garrison Papers.

[3] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, Garrison Papers.

> We are buoyed up and gratified by the splendid cooperation which we have had from almost all the faculty. There were, as many of you know, some bad situations on the campus, and morale was low. The faculty, as a whole, is growing, and we believe it has a clearer vision of the function of the college than ever before.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

In a concluding chapter of a volume dealing with university education, Frankel states:

> American higher education is a social institution, like religion, the state, or the property system, and its problems originate in the same way problems originate in these other institutions. They arise out of discordant traditions, out of internal conflicts of interest and external collisions with other institutions, out of the emergence of new needs and new resources, and, broadly, out of the interplay of human ideas and ideals with the refractory conditions of human nature and the social and physical environment. . . . They have emerged out of the stubborn imperatives on the American scene.[1]

At Peabody several problems were related to the educational program of the institution. This chapter will identify them and will pose the solutions attempted. Preceding this, however, is a presentation of the educational program which the college maintained during the era.

The Educational Program of the College

In its broadest sense an educational program of a college includes all the course offerings and other experiences which have relevance to the attainment of the academic goals of the publics of that institution. In a more restricted sense, an educational program refers to a more or less rigidly defined pattern of courses.[1] Whatever Peabody offered to its publics falls between these ends of the continuum so identified. This section of the chapter contains a description of the educational endeavor of Peabody from the standpoints of purposes, services, academic divisions, course offerings, and degrees granted.

---

[1] Charles Frankel (ed.), Issues in University Education (New York: Harper and Bros., 1959), p. 151.

Purposes

Dressel states that the purposes of higher education are generally recognized as being at least threefold: to preserve the cultural heritage; to pass on the cultural heritage; and to augment, organize, and utilize that heritage.[2] Training men and women for educational leadership and for educational opportunities were two avowed purposes of the institution during this era.

---

[1] An elaboration of a statement by Paul Dressel in his book, The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963), p. 76.

[2] Ibid., p. 20.

Educational leadership

One major purpose of Peabody College was to train its students for educational leadership.[1] In 1937 the college stated that its major responsibility was to equip enrollees for the profession of teaching. Courses were designed to prepare educational leaders, investigators, and teachers for all kinds of positions in the profession of education. Students left the institution to become members of the faculties in teachers' colleges, normal schools, colleges, and universities; superintendents of city and county systems; specialists in state departments of education; principals of secondary and elementary schools, supervisors of instruction; librarians; and teachers in high schools, junior high schools, elementary schools, and kindergartens.

By 1945 the purpose had enlarged to include training for intellectual, civic, and spiritual leadership.[2] Curricula were designed for "liberal-professional training, leading to preparation for (1) living a useful cultural life, (2) assuming civic responsibility, and (3) serving in a useful profession or occupation."[3] The college recognized that, though the classroom has offered almost the only avenue of work for those interested in human development and relationship, many avenues utilizing the educational aspect of life and human relationship had opened up. The college demonstrated that it was broadening its function when it created several new degrees, including the Bachelor of Arts, and reorganized several departments. In essence it added the education of liberal arts majors to its historic practice of training teachers.

---

[1] Bulletin, XXVI (March, 1937), 15.

[2] Ibid., XXXIV (May, 1945), 16.

[3] Ibid.

The college perceived its purpose to be synonymous with the purpose of education.

> The high purpose of education is not social revolution but educational evolution. It is not the overthrowing of principles and ideals that the race has developed through countless generations merely because they are old. Education consists of fostering in each individual those high principles of love for one's neighbor, of thrift and work, of honesty and justice, of intelligent individual action, of fostering desirable social institutions, of making one's contribution to the community, of giving one's means and time to further desirable enterprises.[1]

Further,

> The purpose of education, as it has been conceived at Peabody during the years, is the development of human beings through the type of training which enables them to use and appreciate their mental, spiritual, and physical environment.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid*., XXX (August, 1941), 3.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, p. 4, Garrison Papers.

Its approach was humanistic:

> By humanistic we mean that its efforts have been devoted to an educational policy which seeks to aid the individual to develop culturally, socially, economically, and as a human being.[1]

The college's sphere of influence was the South in particular and the nation in general. It was cited that Peabody, more than any other institution, had set the pattern for educating teachers and had been the greatest influence in the development of public education in its region.[2]

Educational opportunities

A main objective of the college in training people in education was to bring to the children of the South and the nation better educational opportunities.[3] Further, the institution tried "to develop a type of education that would aid in the conservation and development of human and physical resources."[4] Peabody was not established primarily that students might have greater opportunities just for themselves.

---

[1] Bulletin, XXIX (December, 1939), 3.

[2] Annual Report, May 8, 1941, pp. 2-3, Garrison Papers.

[3] *Ibid*., May 11, 1939, p. 3.

[4] *Ibid*.

In addition, it regarded its mission as an opportunity to affect citizenship at its beginning.

> The way in which we train our teachers, their ideals, attitudes, and loyalties, will more than any other factor determine the future course of events in the nation. What goes into the training of the teachers of the youth will be the dominant philosophy of America in the next decade.[1]

Peabody also sought to raise the quality of life through education.

> Public elementary and secondary education, whatever its present failings, is our main and almost only hope for a better world. The training of educational leaders and teachers who will themselves train teachers for the nation's schools is a duty and a responsibility committed to Peabody because of its geographical location and its historic educational policy.[2]

The teacher was looked upon as being the main vehicle for accomplishing the purposes of the college. It was Garrison's belief that there was no substitute for the "high-minded, patriotic, conscientious, properly-trained teacher."[3] He thought of the teacher as being the most potent factor for good or evil in the American life.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., May 9, 1940, p. 4.

> They are the fountainhead who more than any other group determine social, economic, and political opinions in the youth who will tomorrow man our industries, run our businesses, our social institutions, and our government.[1]

He contended that teachers were the key to the future of American democracy[2] and that if they did not defend the system of government and economics in the United States a generation would arise who did not believe in it.[3]

Educational Services

In support of its purposes and objectives, the college sponsored several kinds of educational services that benefited the community, the region, and the nation. These included the Division of Surveys and Field Studies; the Child Study Center; conferences, workshops, and institutes; and the Correspondence-Study and Extension Department.

The Division of Surveys and Field Studies

The Division of Surveys and Field Studies was formed in 1929 through a grant of $200,000.00 from the General Education Board with the purpose of serving the cause of education through improving "the educational, social, economic, and community conditions."[1] After its formation, the Division received two additional large grants totaling $569,000.00 and several lesser grants. The last large grant of $250,000.00 was to be matched by the college. In 1945, permanent support funds amounted to $658,000.00. The scope of the work was enlarged to include the Interstate School Building Service, the Southern Rural Life Council, and the Regional Materials Service.

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to R. G. Fjellstrom, April 8, 1938, Garrison Papers.

[3] *Ibid.*

The staff included specialists in curriculum finance, the school plant, rural education, and community development. Also, professors with special competences from the college and graduate students were utilized in carrying out the Division's projects. Knowledge gained by professors was used in teaching situations in their classrooms; graduate students were trained in research. Together, this group--staff, teachers, and students--conducted comprehensive school and college surveys, and workshops off and on campus for the benefit of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, and librarians on all levels of educational endeavor.

---

[1] Report of the Acting President to the Board of Trustees, May 10, 1945, p. 27, Garrison Papers. Cited hereafter as Report, Acting President.

> Under the guidance of trained specialists, workshop groups plan their programs around such aspects of education as: child growth and development, pre-service and in-service education, curriculum building, school and community coordination and utilization of natural resources, and school plant facilities.[1]

The Division was cited by the General Education Board for serving the area as a research and field service agency to which "the school systems and educational institutions of the South may appeal for assistance in the study of their problems."[2] One of its most active services was considered to be the development of new and improved curricula for the public school of the region accomplished through its program of field work and its corresponding curriculum laboratory held in the summer on the campus for teachers and other educational personnel.

The Interstate School Building Service

From its founding in 1928-29 the Interstate School Building Service had been housed at Peabody College, largely because Peabody had pioneered by including courses in school building services in its curriculum. Established by a grant from the Julius Rosenwald Fund as a cooperative agency among school building divisions of sixteen southern state departments of education, it made available through these departments "floor plans and specifications for school buildings, lunch rooms, libraries, science laboratories, primary and intermediate classrooms, and school and community recreational facilities."[1]

---

[1] Report, Acting President, pp. 27-28, Garrison Papers.

[2] General Education Board, 1942, p. 36.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

When the Rosenwald Fund closed its southern offices in 1938, it turned over to the Interstate School Building Service its schoolhouse planning service which included school building plans and bulletins, bulletins and pamphlets on the improvement and beautification of rural schools, landscaping designs, and much of its equipment. It also gave enough money to carry on the work for three years, later adding appropriations to sustain it through 1945. In 1944 the General Education Board extended a grant to this unit which made it possible for additional plans to be purchased for the existing collection and for plans in use to be revised.[2]

Garrison looked upon this phase of the Division as a means of influencing education in the region and in the nation. He believed that Peabody had more influence on school buildings than any other institution in the nation because publications of the Interstate School Building Service had been issued by the United States Office of Education and because practically all of the men in the state departments of education in charge of school building in the Southeast had been trained at Peabody.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 28.

[2] Ibid.

He hoped that finances would be found to undergird the program so that the influence in the area would be even stronger.

> This is a great responsibility, as well as opportunity. . . . No institution has greater opportunity to guide the destinies of the nation through the teachers than has Peabody. We are anxious that we may avail ourselves of these opportunities and that we may guide in the right direction.[2]

The Southern Rural Life Council

Another facet of the Division of Surveys and Field Studies was the Southern Rural Life Council which was founded in 1943 through a grant from the General Education Board. Its purpose "was to utilize available resources, human, institutional, and natural in developing a comprehensive continuing program of community development."[1]

---

[1] Letter to H. J. Mikell, March 15, 1940, p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*

> The Council (1) cooperates with state, county, and local agencies and institutions in sponsoring institutes, workshops, and conferences for groups interested in the improvements of rural life; (2) assists in the development of community programs; (3) collects important pertinent materials on southern rural life; (4) prepares and distributes bibliographies, books, and pamphlets on rural life; (5) trains potential rural leaders; (6) holds regional conferences; and (7) promotes the establishment of local community, county, and state rural life councils and conferences.[2]

The Council was a cooperative project involving Peabody, Vanderbilt University, Scarritt College, and Fisk University. The membership was composed of leaders in the field of education, agriculture, business, health, religion, and the communications media. Its formation by the four schools resulted from a Southern Rural Life Conference attended by fifty persons in the field of rural education. This group issued a report, The School and the Changing Pattern of Country Life, and recommended that a council be formed for further study.

> The new organization will be composed of representatives of 13 southern states selected on the basis of their interest in rural education, health, agriculture, industry, and the church. It expects to

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 29.

[2] Ibid.

> cooperate with state, county, and local agencies, select and assist in training present and potential rural leaders, prepare and distribute instructional materials, film lists, etc., and conduct conferences and assist in the establishment of state and local rural councils.[1]

It was organized to be a channel, or center, for unifying programs in the South that were formulated to improve rural living. It was intended that a materials bureau be established on a regional basis, that the council offer consultative service to organizations already involved in improving rural conditions, and that worthwhile programs be channeled to the schools.[2]

The Regional Materials Service

The Regional Materials Service was the other segment of the Division of Surveys and Field Studies. It was not an outgrowth of the Southern Rural Life Council, although it was established in 1945, two years after the Council, and was supported through a grant from the General Education Board. Its basic purpose was to provide a "central source of information on research and educational materials throughout the southern region and in each southern state."[1] It had the following functions:

---

[1] General Education Board, 1945, p. 53.

[2] The Peabody Reflector, XVII (January, 1944), 21.

> . . . (1) gives technical assistance to educational agencies and institutions in developing procedures for more effective assembly and utilization of materials on the resources and problems of the state and region; (2) collaborates with the various state centers in the development of work conferences for in-service and pre-service education of teachers, librarians, and others, designed to provide stimulation and technical assistance to the personnel whose duties involve the assembly and utilization of materials; (3) provides for continuous interchange of information, ideas, and experience among the directors of materials collections by means of publications, work conferences, and consultation; (4) maintains a file and issues bibliographies on regional and state materials useful in resource-use education and in projecting programs of research translation; (5) trains leaders in resource-use education; and (6) provides fellowships to interested and worthy graduate students.[2]

The Child Study Center

The Child Study Clinic had its inception in 1937 when Peabody held its first reading clinic.[3] Basically, its program called for diagnostic and remedial work with children retarded in reading ability. However, from its beginning it provided psychological, educational, visual, and auditory diagnoses of children suffering from educational retardation in many fields, not just in reading.

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 27.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Elizabeth H. Stokes, "The Peabody Child Study Center" (unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956), p. 7.

The program of the Clinic involved the following services:

> (1) Diagnosis of cases referred to study; (2) remedial work with individual pupils of elementary, high school, and college levels; (3) student-training for majors in education desiring professional specialization in this realm; (4) consultation and guidance in the Peabody Demonstration School, including special remedial work with junior high students; (5) consultation and guidance with Hillsboro High School students; (6) consultation and guidance with Jere Baxter Public School pupils and faculty; (7) direction of remedial reading programs for college freshmen, Peabody College; and (8) collection of data for research analysis and evaluation.[1]

One of the reasons for forming the Clinic was to train teachers to deal with the problems of the retarded child in order that the child could return to the classroom better equipped for the tasks before him. It was an effort to combat failure among the student population and to make "a scientific approach to the child through objective techniques of study and diagnosis with subsequent remedial training."[2]

When serving as Acting President following

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, pp. 24-25.

[2] "The Child Study Clinic," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXXI (September, 1942).

Garrison's death, John E. Brewton mentioned the following needs of the Clinic: (1) the maintenance of a permanent program at the college with an enlarged staff and proper physical facilities; (2) additional personnel to work in the fields of orthoptic training, speech correction, audio-visual education, special education for the hard of hearing and partially sighted, and extension services related to those; and (3) additional endowment designated for this area.[1]

Conferences, workshops, and institutes

Through the years, numerous conferences were held at the college. These normally lasted for a day or two, at most three, and were not offered for course credit. They were staged in order to meet the needs of the participants.

Conferences dealt with problems relating to the following subjects: audio-visual aids; consumer education; curriculum improvements; the profession of teaching; laboratory leadership; dual education and culture in the South; Latin teaching; nursing education; radio for college students; reading; rural education; school administration; teacher education; and Southern rural life.

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, pp. 24-25.

The time allotted for a workshop was generally one or two weeks. In most instances, course credit was given to those in attendance. Workshops of the following kinds were offered to participants by the college: camp and recreational leaders camp; child guidance and development; community leadership; curriculum development; inter-American life; Red Cross; small elementary school; small rural school; teacher education; university group; wartime programs for local schools; and extended school service. These were under the supervision of Peabody faculty or personnel, but others were invited to participate as leaders, speakers, and lecturers. Many were funded by the General Education Board.

Other meetings, called institutes, dealt with the following subjects: industrial hygiene, light conservation and eye health, reading, and professional relations. The most outstanding was the latter. It was the first meeting of its kind held in the nation, and was under the auspices of Peabody College, the National Education Association, and the Tennessee Education Association. Its participants included members of the faculty and student body of Peabody, the president and director of the field services of the National Education Association, secretaries of educational associations, presidents and professors of thirty-four colleges, and superintendents of state school systems, counties, and cities. From this one meeting in 1938 the institute expanded into eleven states wherein thirty-four meetings were held.[1]

This particular institute had as its purpose

> . . . not to show that educators are either more professional or less professional than the other groups represented on the program, but, rather, to survey the field, find education's place among the other professions, take note of the progress made thus far, establish new goals, and plan ways to achieve them.[2]

The Correspondence-Study and Extension Department

The Correspondence-Study and Extension Department of the college was instrumental in serving large numbers of students. (See Table 10.) It catered to all classifications of students within and outside the institution.

The same number of courses, seventy-nine in thirteen subject areas, was offered in 1939 and in 1945 by the

---

[1] "The Institute of Professional Relations," Peabody Journal of Education, XVIII (September, 1940), 66.

[2] "The Peabody Institute on Professional Relations," The Journal of the National Education Association, XXVII (October, 1938), 199-200.

TABLE 10

ENROLLMENT IN CORRESPONDENCE STUDY AND EXTENSION CLASSES, 1937-1944[a]

Year	Corres. Study	Resident Students	Net Enrolled	Extension Classes	Resident Students	Net Enrolled	Total Corres. Extension
1937	663	315	348	187	21	166	514
1938	531	196	335	155	9	146	481
1939	641	229	412	166	27	139	551
1940	811	202	609	134	27	107	716
1941	656	187	469	87	29	58	527
1942	372	201	171	38	23	15	186
1943	609	160	449	50	11	39	488
1944	664	200	464	80	13	67	531
Totals	4,947	1,690	3,257	897	160	737	3,994
Averages	618	211	407	112	30	92	499

[a] Source: Office of the Registrar. Figures were unavailable for 1945.

correspondence section.[1] Combined classifications for the two years shows that courses were offered in the following areas: Biology, Business Education, Economics, Education, Fine Arts, Geography, History, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, Latin, Mathematics, Modern Languages (French, German, and Spanish), Physical Education, Political Science, and Psychology. The only difference between these listings was that by 1945 Industrial Arts and Latin were dropped and Business Education and Political Science had been added. On the average, each category offered five courses, but several offered only one.

Taking courses of this nature enabled teachers and students to complete the course while working, to earn up to fifty hours credit toward a bachelor's degree, to obtain credits toward certification, to raise qualifications while teaching, and to receive professional training while "in the midst of the actual problems of teaching."[2]

Evening extension classes were conducted in classrooms in downtown Nashville buildings belonging to the Young

---

[1] Bulletin, XXVIII (March, 1939), 6-15; XXXIV (January, 1945), 5-15. No lists of correspondence offerings for 1937 and 1938 were found.

[2] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 6, Garrison Papers.

Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, and the Young Men's Hebrew Association. In 1942, however, when activities related to the war were held in these places, the classes were moved to the Peabody campus. Classes were open to all adults, but credit was given only to graduate students.

Enrollment reached its peak in 1937 when 187 were registered, twenty-one of them being resident students of Peabody. This dipped to a low of thirty-eight in 1942 with twenty-three resident students included. Generally speaking, the extension classes reached a greater per cent of students who were not in residence than the Correspondence-Study courses whose enrollment consisted of from one-fourth to one-half resident students. Lowered figures were the direct result of the war and changes in administrative policy in reference to graduate credit for extension courses. High enrollment in Correspondence-Study was 609; the low was 171 in 1942.[1]

Academic Divisions

To accomplish its purposes and to achieve its objectives, the academic program of the college was organized into three major divisions: the Graduate School, the Senior College, and the Junior College. Because the Demonstration School was used in the training of educational personnel, it is also discussed in this section.

---

[1] Annual Report, 1937-45.

The Graduate School

The Graduate School of Peabody College was the first in the South, and one of the first in the nation, to grant advanced degrees in the field of education. Its first award was made in 1916.[1] Until 1941 it was called the Graduate School of Education but changed its name to the Graduate School because of a change in the academic structuring of the institution.

Through the summer graduation of 1945, the school granted 330 Doctor of Philosophy degrees, 167 of them from 1937-45. The total number of graduate students enrolled in the nine-year period was 14,958 for a yearly average of 1,662. (See Table 11). Until 1944 the graduate enrollment was greater than that of any other institution in the South but was surpassed in that year by the University of Texas and the Louisiana State University.[2]

---

[1] August Degrees, 1938, Garrison Papers. (Mimeographed.)

[2] Report, Acting President, May 5, 1945, p. 6.

TABLE 11

ENROLLMENT BY DIVISIONS OF THE COLLEGE, 1937-1945[a]

Year	Junior College	Senior College	Graduate School	Totals
1937	628	966[b]	1,832[c]	3,426
1938	626	968	2,160	3,754
1939	609	920	2,318	3,847
1940	674	977	2,240	3,891
1941	624	1,006	2,023	3,653
1942	475	984	1,292	2,751
1943	455	762	846	2,063
1944	687	801	992	2,480
1945	859	963	1,255	3,077
Totals	5,037	8,347	14,958	28,942
Averages	559	927	1,662	3,216

[a] Source: Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945.

[b] Includes Vanderbilt University students.

[c] Includes Scarrit College students.

Peabody had the largest summer school enrollment of all graduate schools in the South.

The major emphasis of the school was to offer courses that would supplement and strengthen the experience and baccalaureate training of teachers, administrators, and other educational workers. It was intended that the school be a force for change through developing educational leadership for the Southern region where there was a need for an enrichment of life socially, physically, culturally, and materially.[1]

By 1945 the graduate school had the following needs:

> . . . (2) to provide facilities and time for members of the graduate faculty to do competent teaching and significant research and field service; (3) to strengthen the graduate faculty through increasing the number of distinguished professors; and (4) to provide adequate leadership funds for recruiting potential educational leaders.[2]

The Division of Library Science constituted a part of the Graduate School. It was established in 1928 and by 1930 had received provisional accreditation by the Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association as an undergraduate school for the training of school librarians.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 7.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 12.

The curriculum was then organized on a graduate basis, and the program leading to the Bachelor of Science in Library Science was approved in 1935. Entrance to this program was based on the completion of a four-year college program. In 1940 all limitations on accreditation were withdrawn. In 1945 the Master of Science in Library Science degree was instituted.[1]

A student could finish the Bachelor of Science in Library Science degree in one year. His study included a basic core curriculum of two quarters followed by a third quarter of specialization in school, college, or public library work. Electives could be taken in library work or in any other graduate division.[2] The Master of Science in Library Science degree took two years for completion and stressed enrichment in course offerings.

The major need of the Library School, in 1945, was for a larger, well-trained faculty "headed by a scholarly and vigorous director who will be free to devote at least half of his time to administrative duties."[3]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

The Senior College

The Senior College was the academic division which included the last two years of undergraduate study. In the period under consideration, 8,347 students were enrolled in the junior and senior years for an average of 927 yearly. The highest enrollment, 1,006, came in 1941, the lowest, 762, in 1943.[1] (See Table 11.)

During the war years the average age of the students in this group was lowered considerably because of the broadening concept of the function of the college. Previously, the institution had purposed only to train teachers, but with the enrichment of the curriculum a young student body was drawn to the campus. The addition of stronger departments in the fields of business education, music, fine arts, nursing education, and library science, coupled with the institution's intent to provide leadership in all fields of endeavor, led to this change.[2]

Until 1941 the Senior College and the Graduate School of Education were linked together through the Professional Unit. The unit was a device used to integrate courses "in such fashion as to encourage greater conformity, thoroughness, and scholarship in the education of teachers."[1] It included the Junior and Senior years of the undergraduate level and the first years of the Graduate School. The work in this program was designed to prepare the student for a specific educational position. Students completing the Professional Unit received the Master of Arts degree; those completing the Junior and Senior years received the Bachelor of Science degree.

---

[1] Information obtained from the Office of the Registrar, George Peabody College for Teachers.

[2] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 8.

The Junior College

At the beginning of 1937 the Junior College included only the first two years of the undergraduate program. This was considered to be the time in the student's academic experience when the subject-matter foundation was laid for teaching. Later in the year a plan was announced that extended the usefulness of the division: the Junior College was to be utilized in a program to train prospective junior college, college and university, and teachers' college faculties and administrators.[2] Its function was to be similar to that of the Demonstration School: to train teachers, supervisors, and administrators for the kindergarten, elementary, and secondary education levels.

---

[1] "The Three Year Professional Unit," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXIX (March, 1940), 26.

[2] "The Purpose of the Experimental Junior College," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXVI (August, 1937), 5-6.

To accomplish this objective the Junior College and the last two years of the Demonstration School were combined into one unit. This was done on the assumption that the Junior College was fundamentally more secondary in nature and more "cultural, liberal, and general in its aims and purposes than the senior college which emphasizes specialization and the beginning of professional training."[1]

The Experimental Junior College presented a quality curriculum:

> This unit links in its curriculum the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, thus constituting the capstone of a continuous, unbroken, integrated program of general, cultural, liberal education. The requirements of high quality of instruction and accurate scientific investigation, which will go forward in this new division, will contribute in a substantial way to thoroughness and scholarship on these levels of education so rapidly developing in the United States.[2]

Subject matter of the school included courses in biology, chemistry, economics, English, fine arts, French, German, geography, history, home economics, Latin, mathematics, mechanical arts, music, physics, physiology and health, political science, religious education, and Spanish. The courses were grouped into six divisions: Health and Physical Education, Languages, The Arts, Religious Education, Science and Mathematics, and Social Science.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 6.

[2] Ibid.

In 1937 a total of 171 courses was offered in the Experimental Junior College, thirty-eight of which were on the high school level.[2] From 1937 through 1945 a total of 5,037 students enrolled in the program for a yearly average of 559. (See Table 11.) The highest registration came in 1945 when 859 enrolled, the lowest in 1943 when 455 were listed as students.[3] Registration records revealed that students were classified according to Junior College or Senior College categories through 1945 despite the fact that these divisions were not utilized beyond 1942 for organizational purposes.

The Demonstration School

The Demonstration School existed for three different purposes:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 6-7, 10. [2] Ibid., pp. 15-39.

[3] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 15. Information for the year 1945 obtained from the Office of the Registrar, George Peabody College for Teachers.

> First--To build, in the light of modern educational standards and ideals, the best school possible. In doing this, first consideration is given to those activities which will make for the richest growth of the child, physically, socially, mentally and morally.
>
> Second--To provide for the students in all departments of the college the very best observational privileges in educational procedure.
>
> Third--To provide opportunities for experimental studies in pupil growth, construction of curricula and in learning and teaching.[1]

It was basically an effort to link educational theory with the reality of childhood.

The school was organized into three units: (1) the pre-school, composed of the nursery school and kindergarten; (2) the elementary school, made up of the first six grades; and (3) the six-year elementary school. It was housed in two buildings, one of which was erected with funds granted by the General Education Board. From 1937-44 a total of 7,253 students was enrolled for an annual average of 907. (See Table 12.) Students attending summer school outnumbered regular session enrollees 4,251 to 3,002, or 531 to 376 yearly.

By 1945 the Demonstration School was in need of increased funds for faculty salaries and staff in order to maintain stability in employment and to be able to employ

---

[1] "The Demonstration and Experimental Schools," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXXI (April, 1942), 19.

TABLE 12

ENROLLMENT IN DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL, 1937-1944[a]

Year	Regular Session	Summer School	Total
1937	394	415	809
1938	357	367	724
1939	335	429	764
1940	331	443	774
1941	378	440	818
1942	478	599	1,077
1943	372	700	1,072
1944	357	858	1,215
Totals	3,002	4,251	7,253
Averages	376	531	907

[a] Source: Office of the Registrar. Figures for 1945 are incomplete: summer school enrollment is unavailable.

the best people possible when vacancies occurred. Faculty also needed a quarter off for writing and research. Further, the school was under obligation to provide the best in buildings, grounds, and equipment which at that time he believed it did not do.[1]

Course Offerings

The major task of the college in promoting its educational program was to provide courses of instruction for the student body. A study of these offerings was made from the standpoints of classification and numerical strength.

Classification

Course offerings were divided unequally among nine large categories in 1937 and among thirteen in 1945, 728 and 988, respectively. (See Table 13.) The earlier bulletin of the college listed the major divisions of the curriculum as being The Arts, Education, Health, Languages, Library Science, Psychology and Educational Psychology, Religious Education, Science and Mathematics, and Social Science.[2] In the 1945 bulletin the divisions were The Arts, Business

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, pp. 11-12.

[2] "Courses of Instruction," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXVI (March, 1937), 46-148.

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF COURSE OFFERINGS BY DIVISIONS
1937, 1945[a]

Divisional Classification	1937	1945
The Arts	183	50
Business Education[b]	. .	37
Education	103	91
Health	97	13
Home Economics[c]	. .	57
Languages	113	72
Library Science	37	33
Music and Music Education[c]	. .	417
Nursing Education[d]	. .	16
Physical Education	. .	35
Psychology and Educational Psychology[e]	. .	17
Religious Education[f]	14	. .
Science and Mathematics	86	87
Social Science	65	63
Totals	728	988

[a] Source: Bulletin, XXVI and XXXIV (1937 and 1945).

[b] Not a department or division in 1937.

[c] Part of The Arts in 1937.

[d] Part of Health in 1937.

[e] Part of Education in 1937.

[f] Absorbed into Languages by 1945.

Education, Education, Health, Home Economics, Languages, Library Science, Music and Music Education, Nursing Education, Physical Education, Psychology, Science and Mathematics, and Social Science.[1]

Some areas of instruction that were sub-divisional categories in 1937 were divisional in nature by 1945. Home Economics and Music and Music Education separated from The Arts in 1939 and 1941, respectively. The classification Health was divided into three sections: Nursing Education in 1941, Physical Education in 1943, and Health (having been Health Education in 1940) in 1944. Classical Languages broke away from its parent, Languages, for a brief time and became a separate classification. Business Education, a sub-classification of Social Science, became a separate entity in 1943.

Other departmental classifications of courses were dropped from usage: Comparative Literature, Philosophy, Commerce, and General and Research Courses (Education). Religious Education was a separate category in 1937 but was put into English as a sub-classification the following year.

The greatest change occurred in The Arts. Not only were Home Economics and Music removed from this division, but also the title Industrial Arts was changed to Industrial Arts Education and Arts to Arts Education. Then the division was combined into Arts and Art Appreciation. It had three major sub-divisions: Art Appreciation, Art Techniques, and Art Education. A minor change was effected in 1941 when the division of Psychology and Educational Psychology was renamed Psychology.

---

[1] Ibid., XXXIV (May, 1945), 43-132.

Numerical strength

The largest number of course offerings by major divisions in 1937 were in The Arts (183), Languages (113), and Education (103). These were followed by Health (97), Science and Mathematics (86), Social Science (65), Library Science (37), Psychology and Educational Psychology (30), and Religious Education (14). The largest sub-division offering was in Physical Education (77), followed by Music (67), English (45), and Home Economics (44). Then came Art (39), Curriculum Instruction and Supervision (39), Modern Languages (36), Educational Administration (32), and Mathematics (31).

The 1945 divisions were headed by Music and Music Education (417), Education (91), and Science and Mathematics (87). These were followed by Languages (72), Social Science (63), Home Economics (57), The Arts (50), Business

Education (37), Physical Education (35), Library Science (33), Psychology (17), Nursing Education (16), and Health (13).

Sub-divisions with the largest course offerings were Applied Instruction in Music (296), Curriculum Instruction and Supervision (61), English (45), Music Education (32), Techniques in Art (31), and Biology (27). The Applied Instruction in Music category was larger than all major classifications except the one in which it was included. The Curriculum Instruction and Supervision sub-classification was larger than eight major categories. Fifteen sub-classes were larger than the smallest classification.

Several changes took place in the number of course offerings from 1937-45. The Arts declined from 183 to 50, largely because of the removal of Home Economics from this division. Also sustaining losses were Education (from 103 to 91), Health (from 97 to 13), Languages (113 to 72), Library Science (37 to 33), Nursing Education (20 to 16), Psychology (30 to 17), Physical Education (77 to 35), and Social Science (65 to 63). Registering gains were Home Economics (44 to 57), Science and Mathematics (86 to 87), and Music and Music Education (67 to 417).

The reason for the large increase in music offerings must be credited to the increased number of departments within this division. In 1937 there were only four sub-classifications: General Courses, Junior College Courses, Senior College and Graduate Courses, and Individual Instruction. By 1945 there were seven areas: Music Theory and Composition; Appreciation, History, and Musicology; Conducting, Materials, Choral and Instrumental Techniques; Class Instruction in the Instruments; Music Education; Applied Instruction; and Music Activities.

Changes in the number of courses also occurred in the sub-divisions. Losses were sustained by Art Appreciation, Educational Administration, History and Philosophy of Education, Institutional Administration (Home Economics), Classical Languages, Modern Languages, Mathematics, Economics, and Political Science. Gains were registered in Techniques (Art), Art Education, Curriculum Instruction and Supervision, Home Economics Education, Foods and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, all music departments, Chemistry, Physics, Science Education, History, and Sociology. The number of offerings in English and Geography did not change.

Two methods of classifying courses that were used in 1937 were not evident in 1945, namely, the labels Junior

College and Senior College.[1] A total of 441 courses was listed in 1937 under these classes, 141 under the former, 300 under the latter.

Degrees Granted

The college awarded degrees to students upon their completion of specific educational programs. They were granted on three academic levels: the bachelor, master, and doctoral. A study was made to ascertain the number of degrees granted and the range of individual grants. (See Table 14.)

Number awarded

A total of 4,869 degrees was granted during this period. Almost twice as many Master of Arts (2,415) degrees were awarded as the Bachelor of Science (1,355). Also given were 736 Bachelor of Science in Library Science degrees, 169 Bachelor of Arts degrees, 167 Doctor of Philosophy degrees, 33 Master of Education degrees, and 4 Master of Music degrees. Stated by categories, there were 167 doctoral degrees, 2,452 master degrees, and 2,260 bachelor degrees

---

[1] These classifications were discarded when the administration revised the academic structure of the institution following the resignation of Doak S. Campbell, Dean of the Graduate School and Director of the Senior College.

TABLE 14

DEGREES GRANTED, 1937-1945[a]

Degree	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total
Bachelor of Science	191	198	178	189	157	170	96	85	91	1,355
Bachelor of Science In Library Science	54	69	98	128	136	99	72	49	41	736
Bachelor of Arts							68	40	61	169
Bachelor of Music										0
Master of Arts	254	296	389	495	356	294	163	123	125	2,415
Master of Music					1	3				4
Master of Education			7	10	6	2	4	1	3	33
Doctor of Philosophy	22	20	23	30	26	15	18	7	6	167
Totals	521	583	695	752	671	581	424	315	327	4,869

[a] Source: Board Minutes, 1937-45.

bestowed. The graduate school awarded 2,619 and the undergraduate school 2,260.[1]

A larger number of students received their degrees in the summer graduations, 3,041, for a yearly average of 338. The largest number in a graduating class totaled 471 (in 1940) and the smallest 178 (in 1944). The spring graduates totaled 1,828 with 241 being in the largest class (in 1940) and 139 in the smallest (in 1944) for a yearly average of 203.

Range of individual classifications

The highest number of degrees, 752, was awarded in 1940; the fewest number, 315, in 1944. The highest number with the Bachelor of Science degree, 118, graduated in the spring of 1937; the lowest, 39, in the summer of 1945. The highest number of those graduating with the Bachelor of Science in Library Science, 89, finished in the summer of 1941, the lowest, 18, in the spring of both 1944 and 1945. The Bachelor of Arts degree was first granted in the spring of 1943 when 45 were awarded. Recipients dropped from that high to a low of 9 in the summer of 1944. Although the Bachelor of Music degree had been established in 1941, there were no degrees of this type awarded through 1945.

---

[1] Board Minutes, 1937-45.

The highest number of candidates for the Master of Arts, 298, received their certificates in the summer of 1939; the lowest number, 31, in the spring of 1944. The Master of Music degree was first granted in the summer of 1942 when one person received it; three others were granted it in the spring of 1943. The Master of Education degree was first granted in the summer of 1939, the year it had the largest number of recipients, 7. Others received this degree in the graduations following except for in the spring of both 1941 and 1944.

The largest number of students graduating with the Doctor of Philosophy degree, 22, received their diplomas in the summer of 1940; the lowest number, 2, in the summer of 1944.

Problems and Solutions Related to the Educational Program

In the effort to improve its educational program, the administration of the college was faced with the task of solving some critical problems. These were related to enrollment, instructional reorganization, and academic performance.

Enrollment

Enrollment was a constant concern for the officials of the institution who were hindered from making many educational plans by both depression and war. However, as long as the student population fluctuated in numbers, it was necessary to make some provision for a more realistic approach to curricular offerings.

Changes in student population

Yearly enrollment figures for the college were based on four classifications: college, correspondence, extension, and the Demonstration School.[1] Each set was independent from the other, but all were combined into a grand total when figures were announced in reports. (See Table 15.) In each case, with the exception of the Demonstration School, the totals of each classification excluded duplicates.

Total enrollment rose from 1937 to 1940 but declined by one-third by 1943. In 1944, total registration rose over the previous year by 14 per cent. Generally speaking, the

---

[1] Annual Reports, 1937-45, and records in the Office of the Registrar. Enrollment figures for correspondence, extension, and the Demonstration School for 1945 are unavailable; therefore, figures used are for the years 1937-44.

TABLE 15

TOTAL ENROLLMENTS EXCLUDING ALL DUPLICATES, 1937-1944[a]

Type	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	Total	Average
College	3,426	3,754	3,847	3,891	3,653	2,751	2,063	2,480	25,845	3,233
Correspondence	348	335	412	609	469	171	449	464	3,257	407
Extension	166	146	139	107	58	15	39	67	737	92
Demonstration School	809	724	764	774	818	959	1,072	1,215	7,135	892
Totals	4,749	4,959	5,162	5,381	4,998	3,896	3,623	4,226	36,994	4,624

[a] Source: Office of the Registrar. Figures for Correspondence, Extension, and the Demonstration School were unavailable for the year 1945.

college population and the correspondence enrollment paralleled the fluctuations of the total enrollment. The extension and Demonstration School registrations did not. The extension department suffered a serious decline that started in the year that the United States entered the war and lasted until 1943 when it began to recoup some of its losses. The Demonstration School recorded a rise in the number in the student body in 1939 which continued through 1944.

The year 1940 was significant in many ways. Not only did the largest total enrollment, 5,381, occur that year, but also more were registered in the college, 3,871, and in the correspondence-study department, 609, than in any other year. The largest extension enrollment came in 1937 when 199 took classes. The Demonstration School enrolled its largest number, 1,215, in the year 1944.

The smallest total enrollment for the institution was 3,623 in 1943. That same year the college sustained its lowest number registered, 2,063. However, the previous year the smallest number ever for the correspondence-study classification and the extension department, 191 and 15, respectively, were listed. The lowest Demonstration School enrollment, 724, occurred in 1938.

Graduate registration reached its peak in 1939 when 2,274 entered the student body, excluding duplicates; the lowest registration, 789, came in 1943. The male student population went from a high of 1,057 in 1940 to a low of 343 in 1943. Female students reached 2,834 in numbers in 1940 and dropped to 1,720 in 1943.

Enrollment figures for the college were also kept by quarters: fall, winter, spring, and summer. (See Table 16.) They included students registered through affiliated schools, but they excluded duplicates.[1] The fall registrations ranged from a high of 1,333 in 1945 to a low of 646 in 1943; winter, from 978 in 1941 to 666 in 1943; spring, from 1,207 in 1940 to 711 in 1944; and summer, from 2,577 in 1939 to 1,130 in 1943. The summer school quarter was unique in that its enrollment surpassed by one to three times the registration of any other quarter in any given year. Most students were teachers or administrators signed up for graduate courses.

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 16. Other information gleaned from records in the Office of the Registrar, George Peabody College for Teachers.

TABLE 16

REGISTRATION BY QUARTERS FOR THE YEARS 1937-1945, INCLUDING AFFILIATED SCHOOLS AND EXCLUDING DUPLICATES[a]

Quarter	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	Total	Average
Winter	903	905	917	977	978	859	739	666	912	7,856	873
Spring	962	994	1,089	1,207	1,174	927	722	711	911	8,679	966
Summer	2,214	2,555	2,577	2,546	2,331	1,698	1,130	1,310	1,687	18,048	2,005
Fall	908	901	972	965	929	753	646	1,015	1,133	8,222	914
Total	4,987	5,355	5,555	5,695	5,412	4,237	3,237	3,702	4,643	42,823	4,758
Excluding Duplicates	3,426	3,754	3,847	3,891	3,653	2,751	2,063	2,480	3,077	28,942	3,216
Graduate Students Excluding Duplicates	1,771	2,103	2,274	2,204	1,975	1,220	789	925	1,150	14,411	1,601

[a] Source: Office of the Registrar.

Effective countermeasures

With the precipitous drop in enrollment affecting the stability of the institution, the administration took measures it hoped would solve the problem. It created a faculty committee to make a study of enrollment, curtailed courses in some departments, and sought a military unit for the campus.

A study of enrollment

In late 1942 the president appointed a large group of faculty members to form a Committee on Student Enrollment. Early in the following year this group presented its findings to the full faculty.[1] Their report consisted of a series of recommendations grouped under three headings: (1) activities that were beneficial and should be continued or enlarged upon; (2) activities that were recommended to be initiated; and (3) activities that were harmful and should be discontinued or modified. Each heading was broken down into a number of specific recommendations.

Activities considered acceptable were the following: faculty contact with prospective students; articles and advertisement in state educational journals and other appropriate avenues of publicity; institutional representation at state, regional, and national educational meetings; securing appropriate workshops; and bringing to the campus professional groups for their programs and group meetings.

---

[1] "Progress Report on Student Enrollment by Faculty Committee," presented at the Meeting of the Faculty, February 6, 1943.

Activities to be initiated were listed: a better scheme of scholarships and fellowships; a work-study program; a program of publicity and enlistment involving field representatives; early issuance of the school's catalog; a simplified pre-registration; and expansion of the extension services.

Activities that should be eliminated or modified included these: charging unjustifiable fees; causing students to get checks cashed at local grocery stores rather than at the college; and using graduate students exclusively in the teaching of some courses.

Curtailment of courses

Also scheduled for elimination were departments that had low enrollments and excessive costs.

> The large number of extremely small classes at Peabody makes instruction very expensive. You will notice from Table III that there were nineteen classes scheduled but not taught and eighty-four classes with from one to five students in them. There were 358

> courses taught last summer. Therefore, you can see that a very large number of the courses had practically no students in them. Most of the stronger institutions, such as the University of Michigan, Harvard University, Teachers College at Columbia University, will not offer a course for undergraduates with fewer than seven students, nor a graduate course with fewer than four students.[1]

Also,

> Attached you will find a paper, showing the size of classes for the summer quarter of 1938; also a study of the preparation of senior college and graduate students at Peabody for various fields of service in our region.
>
> The first paper, the size of classes in the summer of 1938, shows that a large percentage of our classes have very small enrollment. For example, there are thirty-one classes with from one to four students; fifty-two with from five to nine. While the table does not show the number having less than eight, there are seventy-nine classes with fewer than eight students. There were several classes which had no students. Counting these, there are eighty-five classes with fewer than eight students enrolled. Most institutions do not offer courses when fewer than eight students apply for the course. Thirty per cent of the courses we offer this summer enroll fewer than eight students.
>
> This condition has existed for a number of years. In fact, it is not as bad this summer as it has been in previous years, because we have been urging the faculty not to offer courses which do not attract students. Such courses are very expensive.[2]

Garrison also sent the Board members a statement of the approximate costs of instruction per student hour. (See Table 17.) The president interpreted the validity of a

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to members of the Board, December 21, 1937, Garrison Papers.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to H. G. Hill, July 26, 1938, Garrison Papers.

TABLE 17

APPROXIMATE COST PER STUDENT HOUR OF INSTRUCTION[a]

Department	Fall 1936	Summer 1937
Biol.	$ 5.92	$ 3.26
Chem. & Gen. Sci.	4.01	3.82
C. L.	30.66	12.82
Econ.	3.64	6.04
Educ.	6.32	2.66
English	2.97	1.63
F. A.	5.24	4.27
Geog.	3.75	2.88
Hist. & P. S.	2.96	2.19
H. Ec.	5.37	6.87
I. A.	7.19	4.14
L. S.	4.93	1.13
Math.	3.76	3.52
M. L.	5.77	4.89
Music	9.39	4.67
Nursing	3.28	3.02
P. E.	6.36	2.79
Physics	17.24	35.71
Psy.	2.87	3.43
Rel. Educ.	10.47	10.00
Soc.	. .	1.74
Phil.	. .	3.39
Median	5.30	3.48

---

[a] Source: Table prepared by S. C. Garrison and included in his letter to the members of the Board, December 21, 1937, Garrison Papers.

department as being that which contributed to the benefit of the overall purposes and goals of the institution despite high costs. He stated, however, that the departments of physics and religious education added little to the program.

The religious education courses at Peabody were not being taken by students who were preparing for church-related vocations. Most of the students in the University Center preparing for religious work were either in the Vanderbilt School of Religion or in Scarritt College. Because these institutions were offering degrees in religion, it was considered "unwise for us to duplicate in an inferior way work done at Scarritt and Vanderbilt, especially when duplication is so expensive."[1] Peabody was paying almost ten times in salary the amount paid in tuition for religious education courses. Also, faculty were being employed for part-time teaching in this area, a practice being eliminated elsewhere in the institution.[2]

It was further recommended that the professor of religious education be shifted to another department which had been hiring extra personnel to teach courses in which he had taken his doctorate. He was also assigned courses in the Department of Education that related to character building. It was deemed logical that courses dealing with the literature of the Old and New Testaments belonged in the Department of English. By action of the Board in 1938 the Department of Religious Education was eliminated.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 53, Garrison Papers.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 54.

At the same meeting, the Board voted to eliminate the Department of Physics because its enrollment had likewise been small and its operation costly. More than ten times the money brought in was being paid from endowment and tuition to support offerings in this area. It was reported that there were practically no high school positions in the area open to people prepared to teach physics and that "we are never called on to recommend anyone to teach physics."[2] The president had the following belief:

> While it is apparently an important subject in the industrial world, yet there are practically no high school teachers of physics.
>
> Physics as a high school subject is passing from the high schools of America and very largely from the colleges. It is a subject which is now taught in engineering and technological institutions almost exclusively.

In order to offer a major in physics, it would have cost the college almost $2,000.00 per student of which the student would have paid only $144.00. It was the president's conclusion that it would be more profitable for students in this field to be trained where there were larger concentrations of students. It was cited that even Teachers College of Columbia University, with over 6,000 students, was offering only two courses in physics, whereas Peabody with far fewer students was offering nine.

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 439.

[2] *Ibid*.

[3] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 53, Garrison Papers.

The offering of courses was a matter of considerable concern to the faculty. Shortly after the Dean of the Graduate School and Senior College took office in May of 1938, a series of faculty discussions was instituted wherein every aspect of the curriculum was considered. One result of these discussions was the elimination of a substantial number of courses, many of which had been inactive for years.[1] The following quotation cites the means by which this was accomplished.

> When I was made Dean President Garrison asked me to develop with the faculty a study of our own program with the view of making any amendments that should be made. This was a new procedure at Peabody. I set up a series of faculty conferences which lasted for months in which the faculty members participated freely and gladly. They were not official faculty meetings; they were faculty conferences on the definition of scope and

---

[1] Letter from Doak S. Campbell to John R. Petry, May 13, 1967.

> program. We pursued this course in a workmanlike manner and we dealt with various aspects of our educational program. I assigned various faculty members to develop papers for discussion in the faculty group. We had a very fine discussion back and forth, and we came to some very good conclusions. This was a fine, wholesome experience. The faculty felt highly complimented. This was an innovation: the faculty had not participated in this manner in the making of programs.[1]

At a later meeting, the Executive Committee of the Board voted to discontinue many offerings in the Department of Modern Languages. Because few students were taking courses, it was stated that they could enroll at Vanderbilt. Only those courses related to the teaching of languages were to be kept.[2] The curriculum in the classical language, Latin, had been severely curtailed in the spring of 1940. Only those courses offered in the summer to the teachers of the subject were retained. Again, lack of enrollment and high costs necessitated such a move.

During the war years, many faculty members, particularly teachers in education and psychology, left for the armed forces or other branches of government service. "Several of us were left to carry the burden," stated one professor. "We had to reduce the courses offered in terms of the faculty we had left."[1] Courses were left in the catalog and were never taught because some thought they should be kept so as to let people know they would be offered later. Other courses were cut in the number of times they were offered yearly. Some were terminated when those who taught them retired.[2]

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

[2] Executive Committee Minutes, August 20, 1942.

At the end of the period, offerings were at a minimum as far as variety and number were concerned. Garrison made an attempt to prepare for an increased enrollment in view of war conditions favorable to the United States. He began hiring new people, one of whom commented on the situation of that time.

> I believe Garrison's purpose in getting me here was to expand the number of offerings. That was a low point over the span of years.[3]

Training military personnel

The third positive action taken to counteract the decline in enrollment was the attempt to obtain a military unit for the campus. Shortly after the president was given authority to contact the armed forces about a training program for military personnel at Peabody, a unit of 600 men in the Army Air Force moved onto the campus.

---

[1] Southall, interview.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Interview with A. Edwin Anderson, May 15, 1967.

Their training activities were grouped under four general headings: academic, military, physical, and flight training. The academic training consisted of mathematics, physics, history and Americanism, geography, English, medical aid, Civil Air Regulations, and remedial instruction. This part of the program was assigned to the personnel of the Peabody faculty; the rest, or non-academic matters, was conducted by the Army. The educational objective was to provide educational training "designed to diminish individual differences and remedy deficiencies in educational background, military discipline, and physical fitness."[1]

Each training period was divided into twenty instructional weeks. However, with processing, classifying, and transportation, the period often ran two weeks longer. Each week consisted of five days of scheduled activity and each student was to give eight hours a day to all aspects of the training program. Not less than nine hours each week were allocated for study. There were not less than five hours of scheduled remedial instruction each week, with at least one hour being devoted to each subject. The time and subject were announced and an instructor qualified to teach was in charge. Sections for remedial work were not to exceed forty students in attendance.

---

[1] U.S., Army Air Force, Historical Report, 333 AAFCTD (A.C.), Vol. II, Appendix, Appendix No. I, Chap. V, p. 1.

Classroom procedures were to reflect a military atmosphere with cadets addressing instructors in the proper manner. The lecture-cookbook method of classroom instruction was utilized with outlines and textbooks serving as supplementary material. Instructors were given the following suggestions:

> It is probable that many instructors will be teaching subjects not included in their major fields of preparation. . . . It is imperative, therefore, that each instructor reexamine his teaching methods and procedures in the light of the objectives of the College Training Program and of the ability and academic preparation of the college air-crew student personnel. . . . Good judgement must govern the amount of work required outside the classroom. . . . Cognizance must be taken of the fact that the aviation students are taking four major academic courses simultaneously, in addition to other training requirements. In view of the limited academic preparation of the average aviation cadet, simplicity in presentations and explanations must be preserved.[1]

The institution agreed to the terms of the contract concerning instruction:

> The Contractor will provide instruction in accordance with the curriculum of the training unit not to exceed 600 trainees at any one time (or such larger

---

[1] Ibid.

> number as the Contractor may consent to instruct). All matters relating to such instruction, including the teachers and instructors, the methods of instruction, the size and number of classes, and the supplies and equipment, shall be in accordance with the requirements prescribed for the curriculum by the government as set forth in Schedule 4, attached hereto. The Commanding Officer of the Training Unit shall consult regarding any of these matters with the authorized representative of the Contractor who shall be the head of the contracting instruction or his deputy, and similarly the Contractor shall consult with the Commanding Officer.
>
> The Government shall pay to the Contractor compensation for providing the instruction in accordance with this article at the rate of Fifteen thousand one hundred ninety-three and 14/100 ($15,193.14) dollars per month beginning on April 1, 1943, and ($9,671.74) per month beginning on May 1, 1943.[1]

In March of 1944 the president announced that the contract with the government for the training of the air crews would terminate by June 30 of that year. The reason given was that it was necessary to transfer a large number of cadets to the ground forces to meet deficiencies in Selective Service and to supply urgent needs of personnel in the ground force.[2]

By the end of June the detachment had graduated almost 2,100 men[3] who had been prepared "both mentally and physically for intensive training in the Air Force through military indoctrination and physical and academic training."[1] From Peabody they had gone to a classification center where they were classified as pilots, bombadiers, navigators, or gunners. Also by this date, the unit had been designated the 2185th AAF Base Unit in line with the program of the Army Air Force to cut down on administrative overhead.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Appendix No. I, Chapter II, p. 14.

[2] *The Nashville Banner*, March 26, 1943.

[3] *Ibid.*, June 15, 1944.

Garrison stated that the coming of the Army to the campus negated any necessity for relieving faculty members of their positions. He had anticipated such action but had deferred it until the possibility of training military personnel appeared.[3] The Dean of the Graduate School and Senior College agreed with the president's statement.

> It was not a question but that the Army tided the institution over that period. The Army program was very important because of the enrollment. The enrollment was low, especially at the graduate level. As I remember it, the Army absorbed from one-half to two-thirds of the faculty.[4]

When their responsibilities with the Army program terminated in 1944, those on the college faculty resumed their duties. The services of those employed after the Army contract was secured were discontinued. Part of the success of the unit was credited by the Army group's intelligence officer to the excellent quality of the faculty.[1] Dr. F. L. Wren, professor of mathematics, served as the college director. Others assisting on the faculty supervisory committee were Dr. Louis Armstrong, assistant professor of political science; Dr. J. R. Robinson, registrar and professor of education; Dr. Hanor A. Webb, professor of chemistry; and Dr. J. R. Whitaker, professor of geography.

---

[1] Ibid., December 16, 1943.

[2] Ibid., June 15, 1944.

[3] Board Minutes, May 6, 1943.

[4] Brewton, interview.

Instructional Reorganization

In his first address to the trustees, Garrison stated that two departments, Home Economics and Music, needed to be reorganized.[2] They had largely become ineffective and were not providing trained leadership for the region. Subsequently, other departments were added to the list needing attention as an attempt was made to stimulate the educational program of the college.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 53, Garrison Papers.

Home Economics

Garrison's opinion about the Home Economics department was shared by others. One principal believed that he expressed the feelings of a number of other principals in stating that none of them would commend Peabody in preference to other schools to a young lady desiring to major in Home Economics.[1] On the one hand, he affirmed that the college was the outstanding teacher-training institution in the South; but, on the other, he would not send anyone to Peabody for training in "Domestic Science." Furthermore, in his opinion, no one trained at Peabody could qualify for a Home Economics teaching position in his school. He did not understand why the college had neglected to improve this department.

In addition, a trustee stated that students trained in Home Economics at Peabody could not be certified in any state. He recommended that the department either be abolished or reorganized.[2] His colleagues agreed, and they passed a resolution authorizing the president to reorganize the department "so as to make it function either as an outstanding department or as a service department only."[1]

---

[1] Letter from unidentified person to S. C. Garrison, undated, Garrison Papers.

[2] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 438.

Reorganization was considered necessary because of the importance attached to the home as the center of family life and of family interest. The training of young women who were going to be wives and mothers in America was considered a task second to none in importance. Therefore, the department was designed to include a large range of interests: family life, health, home industries, house decoration, and landscape gardening.[2]

It was announced that Home Economics students were to live in a typical community while serving as student teachers under the supervision of discipline-related teachers. Centers were established in Charlotte, North Carolina, and Gallatin, Tennessee. When funds became available, a student center was to be set up at Knapp Farm in one of the old houses which was to be renovated to serve as a model house. The department was to cooperate with the University of Tennessee as well as with departments at other state universities. Peabody's plan was to have a small undergraduate program and a larger and superior graduate school. Cooperation on this level was to be with all existing home economics agencies.[1]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, p. 6, Garrison Papers.

Garrison stated that the Home Economics Department had been staffed by teachers who had lost much of their aggressiveness and who were not prepared either through training or personality for the development of a department.[2] By 1940 one member of the department's faculty had resigned and others had been put on a three-quarter basis at a reduced salary. Two new persons had been brought in, one to serve as chairman of the department. A General Education Board grant made possible the employment of another person for teacher training.

From a total of four majors in 1938 the department grew to sixty-four in 1940. A total of 200-300 was foreseen for the future. Accreditation was granted by the State of Tennessee Department of Education and the Federal Bureau of Vocational Home Economics.[3] Expenses for running the department dropped from a cost of $19.00 per quarter hour to less than $5.00. Progress was also noted in the social sciences and sciences: increased enrollment in Home Economics brought larger numbers into these fields which were depended upon for service courses.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 6-7.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 6.

[3] Board Minutes, May 9, 1940, p. 628.

Though a large number of courses continued to be offered, the expected enrollment never materialized. Brewton commented on this thusly:

> This was caused not so much by the war, but by the fact that graduates could not get jobs nor could they get certified. I am sure that the national machinery and the Smith-Hughes machinery, and the University of Tennessee, would not accredit Peabody and let these people get Smith-Hughes jobs. In fact, all of the forces of the University of Tennessee were against Peabody building a big department in Home Economics.[2]

Another faculty member verified this observation:

> The cutback in college offerings hurt every department, but I would not say that it hurt this one as much as it did others. It was the Smith-Hughes standards that could not be met without expansion of offerings.[3]

Music

Also in need of reorganization was the Music Department, mainly for the following reasons:

> . . . we . . . are having no influence in this field. Public school music is important and should be a definite part of our program. It is important that

---

[1] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, p. 13, Garrison Papers.

[2] Brewton, interview.

[3] Southall, interview.

> Peabody furnish to this state and the region teachers who are qualified to develop musical ability and appreciation in our population.[1]

Garrison believed that there was no great school of music south of Cincinnati, Ohio, and that there was an outstanding opportunity to build a great music school in the South at Peabody. The Board agreed and authorized him to proceed with the reorganization.[2] The acting head of the department was retired on an annuity and new faculty members were brought to the campus to staff the department. In 1940 the department was given divisional status, and a new person was brought in to head it. He gave the reasoning behind the move to make it a division:

> It was Garrison's idea that there never could be a good development in these special areas as long as the faculty as a whole controlled the offerings and requirements within those fields. He didn't think that he would ever succeed in getting the whole faculty to vote favorably to loosen things up for a specialty. He was sure that there would have to be a departure from the maximum in the major field. A major could be as small as thirty-six quarter hours. Music is a peculiar field because it has a multiple major: history and literature, music education, theory, and applied music. The idea of a division head who was responsible to the president and not to the faculty for curriculum requirements seemed to be the administrative setup.[3]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 53, Garrison Papers.

[2] Garrison to Mikell, March 19, 1940, Garrison Papers.

[3] Wolfe, interview.

Proof of the validity of this action to make music prominent is given by Brewton:

> I suppose this is his great success. If you look at what has survived, I suppose that it is the one surviving creation that he had been the originator of. Music was favored in its struggle by the administration. Had it not have been favored it might not have survived so well. They have had a good, strong department and they have worked at it; they have maintained high standards. Our present day music department is due to Garrison's interest and his pioneer work.[1]

The reorganization stimulated graduate school requirements:

> We led the way for the school in setting requirements for entrance to the graduate program. We thought that there should be eighty-six hours of undergraduate work in all fields of music before a person could work without deficiencies toward a master's or any advanced graduate degree. If a person did not have that, we held him for deficiencies. Our registrar was not doing this, and he was very much interested in our procedures. Gradually the school began some consideration of that in all other fields.[2]

By September of 1943, the department had become the third largest in the college.[3] By then it was offering additional degrees, the Bachelor of Music and the Master of Music. Its growth was of such nature that consideration was given for planning a new building to be constructed east of the Social-Religious Building.[1]

---

[1] Brewton, interview.

[2] Wolfe, interview.

[3] Executive Committee Minutes, September 29, 1943.

Fine Arts

The Departments of Fine Arts and Industrial Arts were reorganized under trustee authorship into the Division of Art and by 1940 had relatively full classes.[2] It was hoped that the creation of such a division would lead to a program that would influence the industrial life of the region through the teacher and the school system.

> We all recognize that throughout our whole region there is no general educational interest, skill or knowledge out of which a great industrial civilization can grow. If we desire that our region shall become a great scientific and industrial section, then we must begin building a foundation in our schools, as has been done in the East and North, so that when the children become adults they will have aptitudes, interests, and ideals which will make them not only efficient but also effective.[3]

Teachers of vocational subjects were hard to find; therefore, curriculum revision in this area was vital. The school extended its courses to include metalwork, pottery, weaving, woodwork, painting, design, and commercial art. As in the case of the Music, Home Economics, Library Science and Nursing Education divisions, this division was given the authority to develop its own curriculum and degree program. The necessity for its decisions being approved by the full faculty was removed.[1]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, pp. 11-12, Garrison Papers.

[3] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

Health Education

For some time the president was dissatisfied with the program in health education, largely because of the heavy pressure from the Tennessee State Department of Education, the Department of Health, and "one of the large foundations to build an outstanding health program that will meet the needs of the South."[2] He wanted to bring in a well-qualified person, preferably a man with a degree in medicine, who would not only develop a program in public health and establish a program of health for the student body, but would also teach.

Such a program would be accomplished by creating a separate department, Health Education, which was accomplished in 1940. It was to be allied with, though apart from, Physical Education and Nursing Education. Courses already in the catalog were considered to be tentative pending the employment of the person wanted. Further, Garrison advised that the college discontinue the practice of granting the master's degree in health education because there was no outstanding person at Peabody devoting full time to the field of health education.[1]

---

[1] Board Minutes, May 9, 1940, p. 525, Garrison Papers.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Harlan Metcalf, Aurelia Potts, and Laurence Rogers, February 7, 1940, Garrison Papers.

By 1944, there were practically no graduate students in this department. Less than a dozen were taking the curriculum in health education and science on the undergraduate level, a degree plan separate from that involving health and physical education.[2]

Nursing Education

Because of the growth of the enrollment in the Nursing Education Department, it became the Division of Nursing in 1941. Many states fed the program by sending most of their workers in public health nursing to Peabody to train them so that they might educate parents and teachers concerning the health of children. It had become the largest of its kind in the South and the second largest in the nation.[1]

---

[1] Garrison to Campbell, May 13, 1941, Garrison Papers.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to W. S. Leathers, January 24, 1944, Garrison Papers.

In order to secure better training for this group, the administration upgraded the courses in Nursing Education and set up field practice centers in several cities in the South. At these selected sites the students spent one quarter of their college careers in supervised field work.[2] Despite this improvement Garrison desired that the Division's influence be stronger:

> I have never been satisfied with the program here, and I have made very little headway in re-organizing it. Since Peabody is a regional institution, it ought to have very great influence in developing a health program for rural and urban elementary and secondary schools.[3]

Physical Education

Garrison stated in 1940 that progress was being made in all but two departments of the college. One of these was Physical Education which remained a part of the Division of Health until 1943. He predicted its adequate functioning in five years. Earlier he had been confronted with two major problems in this area: departmental morale and misinterpretation of his motives in revising the department.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to C. C. Carpenter, May 14, 1941, Garrison Papers.

[2] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, pp. 13-14.

[3] Letter from S. C. Garrison to B. L. Bishop, September 3, 1941, Garrison Papers.

The morale problem grew out of the cliques and divisions in the department. This situation gave Garrison the opportunity to notify the faculty in this area of the traditional nature of the academic administration of the college: there were no heads of departments, and only divisional chairmen were charged with the responsibility of leading in the making of decisions affecting the educational program of the institution.

The president also cited that the policy of the institution permitted faculty members to have the opportunity of guiding majors in selecting programs of study and in aiding them in selecting thesis problems. He urged that the personnel of the department work together in harmony for the development of a program in handling students with each professor guiding those who desired to major under him or her.

In the first quarter of 1939, the president received numerous letters from former majors and minors in the physical education department protesting any curtailment in

---

[1] Memo from S. C. Garrison to Clara Haddox, Harlan Metcalf, Laurence Rogers, and Dorothy Tolleson, February 23, 1939, Garrison Papers.

the offerings and activities of that department. The writers expressed their sympathy with the aims and objectives of the department and stated that they were well pleased with the education that they had received from the teachers.

The president was informed from at least one source that the letters were written in response to a form letter sent out by two members of the department who had interpreted Garrison's actions as being a move to weaken the offerings in health and physical education.[1] Garrison looked upon his plans to employ a person in health education, and to separate health and physical education, as a move to strengthen Peabody's offerings in health education and not as a means to reduce the offerings in physical education.

The president denied that there was any shred of truth in the allegations of the correspondents. He interpreted the actions of those who requested the letters be sent as a sign of weakness. He reminded one writer that he had served Peabody for twenty-five years and could not remember any other time that a "professor had attempted to bring pressure on the administration through his majors."[1] He considered the action of the faculty members to be grossly unprofessional.[2]

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Dorothy A. Slote, March 28, 1939, Garrison Papers.

Further, he asserted that the administration was responsible for the building of the program at Peabody and needed a free hand in doing so.[3] He suggested some improvements in this area of study:

> . . . For example, the fact that classes do not start on time, the fact that teachers come to class poorly prepared, the fact that students are required to take courses which they have already had on the undergraduate level, and similar facts give me good places at which to start.[4]

The plan to strengthen the study of physical education at the college was implemented in 1940 with the creation of the Department of Physical Education. Health courses were offered in the newly-instituted Department of Health. By 1943 the Physical Education Department had been allocated divisional status in the curriculum. Two years later the number of courses offered by this division had been pared to thirty-five from a high of seventy-seven in 1937. Most of those dropped were on the graduate level, being mere repetitions of undergraduate offerings. Others were combined into single courses.

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Robert Dunkerly, March 28, 1939, Garrison Papers.

[2] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Helen Smith Greer, April 14, 1939, Garrison Papers.

[3] Letter from S. C. Garrison to W. B. Martin, April 3, 1939, Garrison Papers.

[4] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Dorothy A. Slote, March 28, 1939, Garrison Papers.

This lengthy solution bore out Garrison's contention that, though 50 per cent of the problems projected in 1938 had been solved in 1940, the remainder would be more difficult and slower in achieving.[1] He had anticipated two ways of reorganizing the instructional program on the campus and had chosen the second.

> The first is rather ruthless and is composed of a sharp and sudden reorganization. The second way is to recognize the situation as it is and attempt to shape it in the direction in which the program of the institution seems to lead. The second course is much more difficult and requires a great deal more tact and patience as well as perseverance; but it is a more humane point of view.[2]

He saw the need to eliminate about 10 per cent of the teaching personnel and redirect the funds toward the training of teachers for the region and the nation, a practice he believed would improve the college instructional program greatly. He perceived that it would take several years to do this. However, he was intent on doing the very thing he proposed and was committed not to spend funds on non-productive departments. This policy was made known to all concerned.

---

[1] Annual Report, May 9, 1940, p. 17, Garrison Papers.

[2] *Ibid*., May 5, 1938, p. 50.

> . . . over a period of years the program of the institution will be so directed that those departments and subjects which contribute most to a teacher education program will be emphasized, while those that contribute little or nothing will gradually be eliminated or certainly their influence minimized.[1]

In keeping with this statement, the offerings of several departments were severely curtailed by 1945. Courses were reduced by approximately one-third in The Arts (from 73 to 50) and Languages (from 113 to 72); almost three-fifths in Psychology (from 30 to 13); nearly two-thirds in Physical Education (from 54 to 19); and completely in Religious Education (from 14 to 0).

Academic Performance

Every effort was made to upgrade academic performance in the institution. This was accomplished by giving attention to problems related to the quality of student work, the Experimental Junior College, graduate extension courses, new degrees, and to more effective use of area institutional resources.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 52.

Quality of student work

Two things concerned Garrison about the quality of doctoral and master's theses: the mechanics of the writing, and the selection of topics. Students seemed to have more trouble with the former than with any other part of the construction of the thesis. With that in mind the administration made clerical assistance available to them. Professors were responsible for the "worthwhileness of the subject, the content, and the approved methods worked out professionally by their respective fields."[1]

The president felt that the theses should show better selectiveness in their topics. He stated that they should be concerned with the problems of the region as well as those of the West and Southwest: "They should be an effort to raise the cultural standards of the regions that Peabody serves."[2] He believed that there was a dual problem in this respect:

> We must adjust our curriculum to the changing standards of society, and yet hold to high standards in our achievement.[3]

---

[1] Faculty Minutes, VI, June 2, 1937, p. 197.

[2] Ibid., VII, January 15, 1938, p. 240.

[3] Ibid.

The possibility of a student's thesis failing to be accepted was discussed subsequently in a faculty meeting.[1] The president stated that students were switching from one professor to another and that the soundness of the degree depended on the professors concerned. He contended that poor students always should be failed and that the granting of degrees to poor students was a disgrace to the teaching profession. The basic purpose of any degree plan was to aid the student in doing a better job.

Some contended that the quality of work could not be improved through requiring any specific number of hours or a thesis. Garrison replied to this in the following manner:

> . . . There is only one place to start requiring a superior work, and that is in the classroom. The trustees have set up a graduate faculty on this campus, and they expect this faculty to require a superior grade of work of all graduate students. We must learn how to tighten up on scholarship requirements without eulogizing in the catalog. We have regulations in the catalog concerning inferior students. These regulations were put in in hopes that the administration would eliminate poor students. This cannot be done by technicalities. It is a personal matter, and must be handled in the classroom by the professors.[2]

The Experimental Junior College

The Experimental Junior College at Peabody had been authorized by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1936. The Dean of the Graduate School and Senior College had served as the executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges. He brought national interest in the junior college to Peabody.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, VII, March 12, 1938, p. 266.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

> I had an idea that the public junior college was on its way and was a realm in which a graduate school could have a great outlet. I talked . . . about the possibility of making our lower division a demonstration of what a junior college should be--something that people could look at and say, "This is what a junior college ought to be." The people who wanted to work in one could see a junior college in action. In the mid-thirties the people of the United States knew little about what a junior college should be. It was not until the mid-forties that they began to see. As was the case then and up to 1945, all of the junior colleges were college preparatory, and the one at Peabody was just another one of that sort.[1]

The inclusion of the last two years of the Demonstration School into the Junior College unit was attributed to the influence of the Pasadena, California, experiment which was in the public eye: putting four years into the junior college, secondary education through the sophomore year of college.

When reports of the progress of the school were to be made, the Dean of the Junior College called attention to some basic problems of the experiment: (1) nearly one-half of the persons teaching in this unit were graduate students; (2) slightly more than one-half of all the courses were taught by graduate students; (3) a little more than one-half of all credits offered were taught by graduate students; and (4) nearly one-half of all student-hours were taught by graduate students.[1] This was confirmed in a recent interview from the then Dean of the Graduate School and the Senior College:

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

> It was a matter of concern all over the campus. All of the time I was there the freshmen and sophomores were taught by very fine master's degree people who wanted to work on a doctorate. I think this was not atypical at all; this was pretty widespread. Those were the days when scholarships and fellowships were hard to come by. Some taught for very little pay; they were just able to make ends meet. Most of them did a wonderful job of teaching, but the facts are that this is the way it worked.[2]

In presenting his case for a first-class situation, the Dean made the following statement:

> Can Peabody afford to go ahead with this Experimental Junior College, and proclaim to the educational world that it is carrying on a worthwhile project where strong teaching is done, where experimental materials are being tried out, and where the various integrative aspects of the curriculum are being experimented with?[3]

---

[1] Faculty Minutes, VII, December 11, 1937, p. 230.

[2] Brewton, interview.

[3] Faculty Minutes, VII, December 11, 1937, pp. 230-33.

The implications were clear: Peabody was not supporting the experiment in a manner worthy of commendation. The two-year college had become a device for giving a few departments work for graduate students. Ideally, most, if not all, of the instruction would have been carried on by full-time faculty members.

There is no evidence in any records of action being taken by the faculty on the comments of the Junior College Dean. The Junior College was carried in the catalogs of the institution for several years, but after 1941 there was no mention of its being a part of either the organizational administration of the college or of the experimental and demonstration schools sponsored by Peabody. Enrollment figures in the Office of the Registrar did, however, include a Junior College classification through the year 1945.

Most agreed that the experiment was in name only. A former director of the Demonstration School made the following observation:

> The plan for the Demonstration School-Junior College Experimental Unit made sense organization-wise, and it was defensible professionally. Its purpose was to provide graduate students with the opportunity to see this unit operate. It never got off the ground. It did not continue. People heard about it all over the country and came to see the campus. He wanted them in one building. The reason it never got off the ground

was because of the lack of facilities.[1]

Brewton perceived its demise in relation to presidential action.

> The Junior College was always in question in Garrison's time. It has been in name only. It has not been a demonstration of a junior college as such. So, Garrison said, "We won't do it this way." This meant that the experiment as conceived would not operate.[2]

Graduate extension courses

A problem relating to academic performance arose over the practice of the Extension Department offering graduate credit to enrollees upon their completion of extension courses. This issue did not relate to the correspondence service of the institution. Its standards were not under question. It was the administration's contention that extension courses, defined as those classes which met one time a week for a long period of time, should not be offered for credit toward a graduate degree.[3] A decision about changing to non-credit was referred to the Graduate Instruction Committee which recommended that "credit toward a graduate degree earned by extension be discontinued."[4]

---

[1] Windrow, interview. [2] Brewton, interview.

[3] Faculty Minutes, VII, August 18, 1937, p. 203.

[4] *Ibid*., VII, February 16, 1938, p. 247.

The director of extension work alleged that many great universities had strong extension departments that granted graduate credit, and that courses given in the field had been most successful. Garrison retorted that field courses should be considered as resident work but that there should not be many courses of this kind. Peabody then had one field course. It was offered in American Literature and was conducted in New England in the summer.

The president's action in this matter was influenced by the proceedings of the Association of Deans of Southern Schools. In session they had voted not to accept any extention work for graduate credit. The recommendation was passed on to the Southern University Conference which adopted it unanimously.[1] At that time Vanderbilt did not offer any extension work and did not accept it for graduate credit. The University of Tennessee accepted some extension work but had been eliminating the practice by the time the proposition was introduced at Peabody.

Garrison argued that extension courses had not increased enrollment as claimed and had probably decreased the income because of the cost of the program, which in some instances had doubled. He also asserted that it had lowered the standards of Peabody and had taken the time of professors who needed to do research in order to do better graduate instruction.[1] As a result of his prodding the college abandoned this questionable practice. Many faculty members expressed approval for this action. One faculty member stated that she was glad to see this done

---

[1] Letter from S. C. Garrison to Bruce Ryburn Payne and Normal Frost, March 30, 1937, Garrison Papers.

> because people who were doing extension work do not have the facilities to do the study and research work for graduate credit and they cannot stay at the library long enough to do their studying there. It is too hard for their families and for them to have to be gone all weekend after teaching all week and that is what it amounted to. When you go out to them they don't have the facilities and when they come in here they don't have the time.[2]

New degrees

The institution constantly sought to enlarge its influence and its service. As this period began the only degrees that were granted were the Bachelor of Science, the Bachelor of Science in Library Science, the Master of Arts, and the Doctor of Philosophy. Before the end of the era, however, five new degrees were added to broaden the offerings of the college and to strengthen its academic performance: the Bachelor of Music, the Master of Music, the Bachelor of Arts, the Master of Science in Library Science, and the Master of Education.

---

[1] *Ibid*.

[2] Southall, interview.

Offerings in Music

In order to serve the region and the nation more effectively in the field of music, the institution not only added considerably to the course offerings of its music department--and added more students--but it also sought approval for granting additional degrees. These would be for the purpose of training music teachers for the public school and professional musicians for the colleges and universities. By mail vote, the trustees gave permission to allow Peabody to grant the Bachelor of Music and the Master of Music degrees.[1] Their adoption resulted in the implementation of minimum standards demanded by accrediting agencies. This brought about a practice of greater selectivity in candidates and provided them with an improved curriculum.

This was not accomplished without opposition from some members of the faculty.

> People were very much against it. Of course, the Education Department and some others were all excited

---

[1] Executive Committee Minutes, March 19, 1941, p. 571.

> and did not particularly like what was going to be set up--an academic type of teaching music. Of course, this is what they did set up. When they began to grant degrees there was quite a bit of opposition. . . . When you give the Ph.D. in music you are moving beyond teacher education. The whole idea of this kind of thing was not too popular for a long time but they accept it now. . . . From the community angle Garrison was interested in music. The community didn't have any musical center, and it did raise Peabody's standards. It became important in the community.[1]

A member of the education faculty supported this view.

> The music degrees were opposed because they were a means of letting the music people require more courses for their students--almost eliminating education courses.[2]

However, another professor defended the action taken:

> This was an effort to bring about quality enrollment. A youngster with talent would go to a school of quality to get a degree. We were upgrading the standards all along for credits for work, credit received, admission standards, and graduation standards. We started the jury examinations right away in applied music.[3]

He was joined in this position by the Dean of the Graduate School:

> Wolfe was attuned to music education. He brought with him the recommendation that we spread out here because of Peabody's chief relationship to music was the training of teachers in music education. Garrison

---

[1] Brewton, interview.

[2] Crabb, interview.

[3] Wolfe, interview.

> indicated to Wolfe that one of his opportunities was that he could move into this realm, the enlargement of the scope of music education.[1]

The Bachelor of Arts

During all the history of Peabody there had never been an Arts degree given on the baccalaureate level. Other institutions were giving the Bachelor of Arts in the same subjects being studied at Peabody. The president thought that this degree was needed because many of the students wanted something other than the Bachelor of Science degree which was professional in nature. It was also stated that the Bachelor of Science degree held by some students entering the armed forces was not recognized because of the type of training offered under that program. The degree was looked upon by the Army as connoting training in a science, when, in fact, at Peabody it could have been in numerous fields.[2]

Generally speaking, the faculty looked upon this suggestion of having the B.A. as a means of stimulating enrollment. One professor made this statement:

> Somehow it had come up two or three times because of the interest of people--usually content people--who did

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

[2] *Ibid*., March 17, 1942.

> not want their children to be teachers. They sold Dr. Garrison on the idea. We were hard up for students and funds, and they told him that we could fill up the freshman and sophomore levels with students who did not want to be teachers. This matter came up for a vote of the faculty at the first faculty meeting I attended after returning from service in war-impacted communities. I spoke at length against it stating that our endowment funds were for the education of teachers and we had no right to use them for other purposes, and we were undermining the things for which we were noted.[1]

Crabb opposed the adoption on the basis that the B.A. candidates were relieved of any requirement in education: "They could major in English, history, and so forth, and leave off education courses . . . I was against it."[2]

Garrison was for professional education and had devised many programs for teachers, but this was not in conflict with his views on the Bachelor of Arts Degree.

> It was pretty logical for Garrison (to have encouraged the B.A.) because he came here with the A.B. He did not see any conflict with the undergraduate school. He looked upon Peabody as a graduate school. He was Dean and he knew that there were some who preferred the B.A. to the B.S., both students and faculty. He also thought this would improve the enrollment. There was no conflict with his concept of graduate education.[3]

The first degrees were awarded in the spring of 1943. During this period a total of 169 were awarded. That the degree was popular was indicated by the fact that the number of Bachelor of Science degrees granted dropped almost 43 per cent the year following the addition of the new degree. The ratio of Bachelor of Science to Bachelor of Arts was roughly 3:2 from the time the latter degree was first offered.[1]

---

[1] Southall, interview.

[2] Crabb, interview.

[3] Windrow, interview.

The Master of Science in Library Science

Another significant achievement was the establishment of the degree Master of Science in Library Science by the Graduate School. This was a second year of study in the Library Science program and was designed to enrich the curricular offerings of this part of the institution. The program was initiated in the summer quarter of 1945.[2] However, there was no record of any official action taken by the Board concerning the authorizing of the granting of this degree either in full session or by the Executive Committee of the Board.

The Master of Education

On at least two different occasions members of the faculty spoke out urging the adoption either of an intermediate degree between the master and the doctorate[1] or of a four-quarter master's degree of a more practical nature than the Master of Arts.[2] Following these declarations, the Graduate Instruction Committee made this recommendation:

---

[1] See Table 14, p. 163.

[2] Report, Acting President, May 5, 1945, pp. 12-13, Garrison Papers.

> 1. That the college award the degree of Master of Education, a graduate professional degree, for the student who is interested in teaching rather than research, with the following minimum requirements:
> a. three quarters of residence
> b. completion of 48 hours of graduate credit
> c. all work on this degree to be done in residence.[3]

One basic difference between this degree and the Master of Arts was that the newly recommended degree required twelve additional hours in course work instead of the six hours for the thesis. Courses would be suited to the interest of the student. Some professors considered the new plan to be superior to the long-granted Master of Arts.

Some stated that the new degree would raise enrollments, but Garrison stated that this was not the problem. "The problem was the job to be done in the South," he maintained.[4] The faculty voted favorably to grant the degree with the stipulation that details of its requirements be brought to the faculty meeting by the Graduate Instruction Committee.

---

[1] Faculty Minutes, VI, November 6, 1937, p. 211.

[2] Ibid., VI, October 9, 1937, p. 205.

[3] Ibid., VII, February 6, 1938, p. 247.

[4] Ibid., p. 251.

The Committee responded at a later meeting by recommending that there be two types of master's degrees: (1) the Master of Arts, with forty-two quarter hours required, including a thesis; and (2) the Master of Education, with forty-eight hours required, not including a thesis.[1] An alternate scheme was proposed which would have retained two Master of Arts degrees, one the same form as the old one, the other embodying the suggestions submitted for the Master of Education degree. A different degree, new in arrangement of courses and in purpose but also called the Master of Education degree, and requiring two years of graduate study, was also proposed.

The motion was made that the plans for the two Master of Arts degrees be adopted, which in effect would allow the granting of the Master of Arts with or without a thesis. An amendment was submitted that would require an additional project of some nature, without credit, for the non-thesis master's degree. This was defeated and the motion was passed to have two Master of Arts degrees and a two-year Master of Education degree.[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., VII, March 12, 1938, p. 265.

Discussion revealed the intention to make the Master of Education degree a teacher's degree. It would emphasize teaching and testing teaching ability. Candidates were not only to have two years of successful teaching experience and a unit of work in their major field, but also they were to be required to practice teach.[2] For the second time the degree was approved in principle by the faculty with the stipulation that the Graduation Instruction Committee work out further requirements to be presented to the faculty at a subsequent meeting.[3] The Board authorized the granting of the degree in its annual meeting.

The Dean of the Graduate School announced the following regulations in response to the faculty's request:

> The Master of Education degree is designed to give advanced work in some specific educational field. It calls for the completion of two years of graduate work planned to prepare the candidate for a specific position in the field of education. The first degree's work will normally lead to a Master of Arts degree at Peabody or at some other recognized graduate school. The second year of at least 36 hours must be completed in residence

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 268.

[2] _Ibid_.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 269.

[4] Board Minutes, May 5, 1938, p. 438.

> at Peabody. Before admission to candidacy, the candidate must have had at least two years' experience in educational work.
>
> Not later than two quarters before the completion of the second year, the student will outline a tentative program of studies that is intended to fit him for the specific type of educational work he intends to pursue. Upon the receipt of this program, the Dean will appoint an advisory committee, who will have full charge of the student's work. They will advise with the student regarding the fitness of his program and make such modifications as may seem necessary. On the approval of the program, the student will be admitted to candidacy.
>
> The program of study must be completed within five years.
>
> The student must make a written report of a project he has carried on, or contemplates doing, in his field of study or activity, acceptable to his advisory committee. The project may involve teaching, supervision, or administration in a school system.[1]

Additional discussion revealed that the degree was intended to fit a man for a job or to strengthen the position he already had. It also made it possible for a person who did not intend to pursue the doctorate to receive a degree beyond the Master of Arts. It was not intended that the degree be a dumping ground for those who failed to pass qualifying examinations for the doctorate. Discussion was also centered on whether or not the degree should be called a master's degree because of its intermediary nature, and on whether or not the institution should offer the Doctor of Education degree.[1]

---

[1] Faculty Minutes, VII, March 12, 1938, p. 291.

The first announcement of the new degree appeared in the college catalog for the school year 1938-39, although no requirements were included in the announcement because committee action concerning them was pending. Two years after its adoption Garrison was endeavoring to explain it to the chairman of the Board.

> The Master of Education is a two-year Master's Degree similar to one given at Harvard. As a matter of fact we modeled ours somewhat after the one given in the School of Education at Harvard. A number of other institutions have taken the same step, and there are now probably six or eight of the better institutions giving the two year master's degree. This not only has the regular academic and professional work connected with it but also has a period of apprenticeship in the field.[2]

Cooperation in the academic community

Another important attempt to encourage a stronger academic performance came in the form of institutional cooperation. It was basically an effort to use the educational resources that were available in the best possible way for the greatest good of the members of the intellectual community, especially those enrolled in research and graduate study.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 285-90.

[2] Garrison to Mikell, June 30, 1940, Garrison Papers.

Survey of adjoining educational institutions

This cooperation was the outgrowth of a "comprehensive self-survey in 1935-36 of the educational and research programs and library facilities of the three neighboring institutions."[1] The survey resulted in the following plan:

> (1) to coordinate and extend the curricula for advanced education and research in this educational center, and (2) to develop a joint or cooperative university library system.

The basic benefits of cooperation made it possible for the adjacent institutions to offer courses available to all students enrolled while maintaining their separate and independent status, to avoid duplication of an unnecessary nature, and to save money or to divert monies to other projects and offerings. It was hoped that such an arrangement for free interchange would be of interest to those considering grants and gifts to institutions of higher learning.[1] One former administrator made this observation:

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, p. 18, Garrison Papers.

[2] _Ibid_.

> It became routine for a student enrolling in Peabody to sign up on either Peabody's campus or Vanderbilt's campus for courses. The general agreement was that the student enroll in the institution from which he planned to receive his degree. His major would be determined by his major professor at Peabody; then he would outline the student's program. For a master's degree Peabody had about enough courses to satisfy most persons who wished to become teachers in secondary schools; although many master's degree people would have a choice of one or two courses in a very fine department. At the doctoral level there was more interchange because one would need more courses for a higher degree, and they had a good graduate program at Vanderbilt.[2]

An attempt was made early in the period to establish definite policies that would govern the relationship of Peabody with Scarritt College and Vanderbilt University:

> Peabody College will offer all the courses it thinks basic to the professional training of teachers. It will offer other courses which are needed by teachers but which are not so basic, provided that they are not offered in neighboring institutions. In case the offering of courses which are not basic is cheaper than purchasing them from neighboring institutions, we reserve the right, as would be done in any business, to offer the courses themselves.[3]

Peabody did not intend to offer an array of courses for all professional workers. Rather it was offering those courses which had to do with the professional training of a large number of educators: elementary teachers, high school principals, superintendents of schools, workers in state departments of education, college teachers of education, college administrators, guidance workers, and workers in educational research.[1]

---

[1] Annual Report, May 11, 1939, p. 5, Garrison Papers.

[2] Campbell, interview.

[3] Annual Report, May 5, 1938, p. 55, Garrison Papers.

There were offerings in content courses but limited to the ability of the resources of the college to provide such. In some areas there was duplication with Vanderbilt, as in English and psychology. Because both of these areas were basic to the training of teachers, Garrison thought that Vanderbilt might not have reason for offering those duplicated at Peabody. He did not foresee Peabody dropping courses simply because they were being offered at Vanderbilt, but he did agree that the practice of duplication, where not absolutely necessary for either institution, should be abandoned. The psychology courses, offered long before Vanderbilt undertook to offer similar courses, were strong and were conducted by a nationally-known department.[2]

Again,

> Interchange was based on friendly relationships among faculty members of the two institutions and in

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., pp. 55-56.

> accord with stated policies. There were some better relationships in some departments than in others, but I do not know where it was difficult because of the personnel involved. Naturally, some were in rapport all of the time. Every summer there were Vanderbilt professors who taught at Peabody. This was routine. We (the Education Department) brought six or eight over each summer.[1]

It was predicted that with this cooperation more students would enroll at Peabody without any additional expense to the college, mainly because of both institutions being able to absorb a large number of students into their comparatively small classes, making an increase in teaching staff unlikely and unnecessary. The increased enrollment would do three things:

> It would increase the income of the institution; it would enable us to train more superior people who are in demand; and it would greatly improve the morale of some of the classes on the campus where the enrollment up to this time has been rather small.[2]

Establishment of the Joint University Libraries

The document containing the agreements for cooperation incorporated a statement of the plans for a unified library administration for all of the educational institutions in the center.

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

[2] Garrison to Mikell, May 14, 1937, Garrison Papers.

> The administrative officials at Vanderbilt and at Peabody feel that the consummation of this joint library should be our first large objective and that most of our efforts to develop a great educational center here should be devoted at first to this objective.[1]

The overriding goal was

> . . . to strengthen undergraduate, graduate, and professional offerings with a view of providing a university center equipped with personnel, library and laboratory facilities to do superior work on all these levels and to provide adequate resources for research.[2]

This was an outgrowth of a resolution by the General Education Board to assist in providing adequate library facilities for Vanderbilt and Peabody when these institutions could agree on a plan to recommend to that Board. In 1937 the General Education Board made a conditional gift of $1,000,000.00 for the purpose of erecting a library building, or for endowing a building, on a matching basis, provided that a plan of operation for the building be presented to it.

After some consultation about what educational programs the library should serve, it was agreed that

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

[2] "The Joint University Libraries," The Peabody Reflector, XV (January, 1942), 37.

> the library resources which would be needed should be adequate to provide (1) the essential collateral reading for all courses to be offered in the two institutions, (2) a comprehensive collection of those standard works--books and periodicals--in which the various disciplines have evolved and become defined, (3) the primary sources in those fields as a basis for research, and (4) well-selected books for voluntary (cultural) reading.[1]

In December of 1938 a trust indenture was accepted by the cooperating institutions establishing the Joint University Libraries on a permanent basis. The ownership was vested in Peabody College and Vanderbilt University as corporate trustees for the benefit and use of the two institutions plus Scarritt College for Christian Workers.

The general supervision and control, and management of all funds, was invested in the Board of Library Trustees which was composed of representatives from the governing bodies of the three cooperating institutions along with the chief administrative officer of each institution. The two institutions holding corporate powers had three representatives each, Scarritt one. The Board delegated responsibility for supervision and general management to a president or chancellor of the group.

The Executive Committee of the Board of Library Trustees, composed of the chief administrative officers of the cooperating institutions, selected and appointed the Director of Libraries. Their appointment was subject to the Board for whom they acted. The Director, in turn, was responsible to the committee that selected him. He was responsible for selecting a staff and for the administration of the library.

---

[1] Ibid.

A faculty advisory committee, known as the Joint Libraries Committee, was appointed to aid the Executive Committee and the Director in the administration of the library. Membership was limited to seven, three each from Peabody and Vanderbilt, one from Scarritt. Their appointments, made by the presidents of their institutions, were for three years and were subject to confirmation by the Board of Library Trustees.

One of the first projects undertaken by the Joint University Libraries was the preparation of a union catalog of the principal libraries of Nashville. Another was the acquisition and maintenance of a Library of Congress depository catalog. In the planning and arrangement of the building, provision was made for the following library functions: (1) housing of books, (2) reserve reading, (3) reference service, (4) browsing, (5) graduate work and research, and (6) reproduction of materials.[1] The room provided for graduate work was a memorial to Bruce Ryburn Payne, former president of Peabody, donated by the faculty and staff of Peabody.

One speaker at the dedication of the library stated its significance:

> 1. It marked the culmination of a full decade of planning by educational foundations, higher institutions of education, and libraries, which resulted in a clearly defined purposeful program of educational cooperation. . . . 2. It marked the emergence of a new type of educational administrative device. . . . It was worked out as a part of a program of curriculum revision in which not only the curriculums of all three institutions were considered together but also the demands of the curriculums made upon the libraries of the three institutions were considered . . . it marked the firm establishment of a new concentration of library resources upon which work could be based. . . . It has provided for increased bibliographical apparatus and films for the use of scholars. . . . It is of the nature to attract other collections and gifts devoted to library service. . . . It prepared teachers and librarians for more effective teaching and research.[2]

The general departmental and school libraries already in existence became a part of the Joint University Libraries system under the new agreement. The selection of the librarians and other staff members for these newly incorporated branches was made subject to the approval of the heads of the respective institutions. Their appointments were made by the Executive Committee of the Board of Library Trustees. Policies affecting such libraries were made subject to the approval of the institution concerned.

---

[1] A. F. Kuhlman, "Program of the Joint University Libraries," The Peabody Reflector, XV (January, 1942), 15-17.

[2] Louis R. Wilson, "The Significance of the University Libraries," The Peabody Reflector, XV (January, 1942), 15-17.

Even as Vanderbilt and Scarritt had some areas of emphasis that Peabody did not have, the reverse was also true. Peabody carried the academic work of the cooperating institutions in home economics, art education and music. It alone had programs for the graduate student in teacher training in these areas.

Many faculty members thought that Peabody leaned over backwards in an effort to cooperate and that such cooperation had very little support from Vanderbilt. To them, Peabody had always been the loser. Part of this was based on the belief that Vanderbilt faculty had considered Peabody as a second-rate institution and that it really was not a serious educational enterprise. Campbell found positive value in the experience, however:

> It has always been good in my estimation. We always have had students go over there because Peabody could not afford to give every course that is offered in the area and Vanderbilt has never been interested in giving courses in education. That was the reason why Peabody

> is located right where it is. It was deliberately brought here to be the neighbor of Vanderbilt.[1]

> Cooperation was based on personnel and policy.

> The presence of strong people in departments or divisions frequently determined cooperation between Vanderbilt and Peabody in the area of majors and minors. For example, doctorates in similar departments were sometimes used by Peabody to complete doctoral committees and to enable students to major in fields in which Peabody was not adequately staffed for doctoral purposes.[2]

Brewton stated that Peabody students had not benefited as they should from the new arrangement.

> When the library was finished, Garrison was advised by some members of the faculty that Peabody ought to maintain its library separately. He was advised by the Library Committee to keep all books over here. When the library was completed the room that was allocated for our books, plus one room that we could have used for a special library, were not used by us. My contention is that we lost through the years because we still have a library over here and many students never get over there. If we had put all of our books, all of our things over there, everybody would have had to use the library and we would have got our money's worth. Later on, when we began to put more books over there, and to get rooms for special activities, it was full. Peabody withheld its books when in reality they had a choice then. It was a question of giving up something. The original intention was that they have a Joint University Library. The possibility of combining as much material as you wanted to existed.[3]

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

[2] Southall, interview.

[3] Brewton, interview.

He also contended that improvements should be made for the Peabody portion of the Joint University Libraries:

> There is an urgent need for the Peabody Library Building to be completed and improved. The bookstacks are now so full that it is impossible to return books to the stacks where they belong. . . . The light, air, and working space for graduate students in the stacks are so inadequate that efficient use of the books and periodicals there is impossible. . . . The entire building should be redecorated and flourescent light should be provided in the reading room.[1]

---

[1] Report, Acting President, May 10, 1945, pp. 32-33.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The financial depression and war weighed heavily upon Peabody during the 1937-45 era. Most of the problems of the institution stemmed from these two crises. Part of the inability of the administration to solve completely all the pressing issues facing it can be laid at the doorstep of these consecutive national emergencies.

That Peabody survived during this time as a private institution of higher learning with a narrow purpose is a tribute to the administrative skills of Garrison and his administrative officials. Basically, it was the skill of perceiving what the problems were, realizing what solutions were possible, implementing the decisions chosen to lessen and dissolve these issues, and anticipating the beginning of a new era that would commence after the worldwide conflagration ended.

This administration preserved the image of Peabody as a college for teachers whose primary mission was to improve educational opportunity through the Southeastern

United States. Despite the faults which appeared or the missteps which were taken, the resources of the institution, though sapped to the point of collapse at one point, were carefully protected so as to avoid their complete dissolution or a change of identity. This action allowed the college to continue to revise and to improve its educational ministry in the face of threatened prostration.

The institution practiced austerity by holding its expenditures to the money it had and generally withheld expansion of its program until it was assured of an enlarged income and a growing enrollment. During its most pressing period it chose to pare its courses to those which were essential to the training of teachers in order that it might remain solvent and still fulfill its basic educational philosophy. It later adopted new degree programs in the hope that enrollment might be strengthened quantitatively. After its survival, it began to assume a stronger academic role in an era of a more democratic educational system which found old standards of entrance into the institutions of higher learning falling by the wayside when the flood of veterans reached its doors.

In essence, Garrison's action as Peabody's chief administrator was of a holding nature. Peabody did not undergo the spirit of change, social protest, and repudiation of the past that Rudolph said was one of the most significant characteristics of the American campus in the 1930's.[1] However, it did sustain some changes and withstood great uncertainty that Rudolph said were the order of the day in the 1930's and 1940's. It stood the test of survival, enduring despite financial privation stemming from a dearth of students during the early and late years of the era under investigation. During the struggle for leadership survival, Peabody College provided graduate education and library programs for teachers who had no other Southern college available.

The ability of presidents and other officials in our era to maintain the financial strength, faculty morale, and educational balance of their institutions depends upon their knowledge of how such a force as war can cause problems. This treatise of the issues of another disturbed era can be a source for offering possible solutions. This inquiry is not a manual telling how to approach institutional issues and to effect their dissolution. Rather it presents what did happen to an institution faced with the problems of financial support, faculty stability, and educational programming. The findings and conclusions, implications, and recommendations of this study follow.

---

[1] Rudolph, pp. 465-68.

Findings and Conclusions

The chief sources of information for this study were the Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Trustees; Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty; the papers of Bruce Ryburn Payne, S. C. Garrison, and Henry H. Hill; interviews with present and former institutional personnel; and literary works, including dissertations, specialist in education independent studies, theses, publications of Peabody College, newspapers, and periodicals.

Included in this portion of the chapter are those disclosures related to the problem areas selected for investigation: finance, faculty, and the educational program. Also, the findings pertaining to the broader field of higher education will be stated. Additional statements will answer the eight questions posed in Chapter I that were developed to implement the major purposes of the study.

Concerning financial problems

One major financial problem was related to income. Receipts from endowment failed to increase. Decreasing funds prohibited the college from giving the aid it normally would have extended to students. Money was needed to endow specific services which were already a part of the educational program as well as to provide for additional instructional services. Additionally, numerous parties defaulted in their payments on bonds purchased by the institution. Also, student fees failed to produce as much income because of a drop in enrollment in the forties; nor was there enough working capital to sustain the college in times of emergency.

These needs were met by making more productive endowment investments, setting a higher limit on stock purchases, settling bond defaults at reduced interest rates, obtaining a military unit for training on the campus, and increasing the working capital through grants from private foundations and alumni support.

Another problem related to salaries. Wages had been reduced drastically at the college and Demonstration School during the depression. For the faculty in the college a salary scale was established and later increased. However, when salary raises were asked for some but not for all, some faculty members claimed that there was no scale in existence. Additional financial relief was given the institution when authorization was obtained to employ some faculty members for three quarters instead of four. This allowed the school the opportunity to hire summer school teachers at lower rates than regular faculty.

Demonstration School salaries were not restored to their pre-depression level after the end of this era. Teachers there did not have comparable rank; neither were the salary adjustments on a par with those of the college regardless of degrees or tenure, nor did the Demonstration School get to participate in the college salary scale. Cuts in clerical and janitorial salaries were restored in the era through saving on projects sponsored by the college. Other increases were added subsequently.

A third major problem centered upon inadequate business procedures which Garrison inherited upon his assumption of the office of president. These included allowing an indebtedness of nearly $70,000.00 in unpaid bills to accumulate; not collecting unpaid student loans; and spending large amounts on administrative costs. The method of purchasing supplies was deemed unsatisfactory and the office of business manager was considered to be non-essential. The Board contended that there should be improved management and control of the financial procedures of the college.

Policy was established to allow bills to be paid immediately upon their occurrence, and all indebtedness was cleared. Collection of loans was begun and was extremely successful in reducing the amount of the General Expense account. When supervision of the offices of the bursar and the business manager was assumed by the president, the General Expense rose again. This merger of positions allowed the president to control fully the operations of the business office, including purchases. It also made possible the elimination of the office of business manager. Trustees asked for and got better management and control of the financial affairs, especially with reference to the bonding of employees, check countersigning, and accounting procedures.

The last major financial problem centered around buildings and grounds. Through the years, not enough money had been allocated for their upkeep, and before 1937 all kinds of repair were needed on campus buildings. Many high schools and most colleges surpassed Peabody in the equipment it made available for learning purposes. At least five new buildings were needed in order to maintain a superior program. Coupled with this was a need for a new power plant.

To bring buildings and grounds up to minimal maintenance standards, funds were increased an average of 30 per cent yearly over previous expenditures. Painting and repairing were completed by 1941 but were again made necessary when the Army unit left the campus. Additional monies were designated for equipment. Some departments, such as Music, received adequate furnishings for the first time, while others, such as Home Economics, were merely reequipped. The library received a substantial increase in funds to be expended plus some fine collections of worthy volumes. Plans for new buildings were not realized, however. The kindergarten structure was the only edifice built. War conditions directed that strategic materials be assigned to military needs.

Relating to faculty problems

Garrison felt that the problem concerning the quality of the faculty was the largest facing the institution. He wanted to develop the teaching personnel into an outstanding group of educators. Though he considered the Peabody group generally to be effective in its educational pursuits, he thought that many teachers in the colleges and universities of America were unprepared to meet the challenges of the era. The Board also recognized the need for a prominent faculty which would produce a high quality of leadership for education.

In order to keep quality faculty at a high level, the administration decided to adopt measures governing retirement, annuity, tenure, and faculty replacement. The retirement plan adopted effected the termination of personnel reaching the age of sixty-five and the annuity plan coupled with it gave all participants a degree of security. The purpose of the tenure plan was to guard against employing those deemed not capable of fitting into Peabody's plan for excellence in education. When enrollments began to dip during the war, in order not to be saddled with extra personnel, Garrison decided that personnel would be retained in only those departments vital to the attaining of the objectives of the college. He did not replace departed faculty members but chose to wait until the war's end and then seek the personnel he deemed fit for Peabody.

The administration labeled the relationship of the faculty to the educational program a second faculty problem. The issue arose partly because of the individualism that characterized the teaching personnel. Garrison claimed that they were not always able to see the purpose of the college and that this affected the development of the educational program.

He urged the teachers to assist in fulfilling the mission of the college and to enlarge on the services they were rendering to the college and to the region. Special faculty programs were held to seek to better their understanding of the purposes and objectives of the college.

Pertaining to the educational program

The first major problem relating to the educational program was enrollment. After experiencing a gradual rise from 1937-40, figures for the four major classifications began to decrease with the exception of the Demonstration School. The major cause was the involvement of former and prospective students in both the military and economic aspects of World War II.

Measures were taken to counteract this downward trend in enrollment. A Committee on Student Enrollment formed, met, and reported means for keeping and securing students. Prior to this those departments, including Physics, which had low enrollments and excessive costs were eliminated together with many non-active courses in other departments. Some Modern Language offerings were eliminated during the war. Further cuts came in all areas when faculty members left for the armed services and were not replaced.

Another attempt to remedy the enrollment predicament was to secure an Army unit for training on the campus.

The second major problem involved instructional reorganization. Several departments had become ineffective and were not providing trained leadership for the region commensurate with the role of the institution. Special attention was given to improving the offerings of Home Economics, Music, Fine Arts, Health Education, Nursing Education, and Physical Education. All were given authority to develop their own programs and were advanced to divisional status during this era.

Changes produced unusual growth in the Music Department whose enrollment advanced to third place in the college, and in Nursing Education which was the largest department of its kind in the South and the second largest in the nation. Growth took place in the Home Economics Department but did not reach its expected potential. Enrollees in the Health Education Department dwindled to almost nothing.

Some of the above-mentioned departments lost courses along with others in the college. Funds allocated were transferred to departments training teachers or to departments whose courses contributed to teacher education.

One group of problems related to academic performance in the institution. Attempts were made to upgrade the quality of student work, particularly theses and dissertations. The president urged the faculty to take more responsibility in promoting scholarship. The Experimental Junior College, which had become a device for giving a few departments work for graduate students, was abandoned. A failure to achieve its purposes, the inability to secure independent facilities, and a lack of interest on the part of the president were instrumental in its demise.

Extension courses for graduate credit were terminated for the following reasons: (1) teacher production and teaching standards were lowered; (2) resident enrollment did not increase from this service; (3) costs were excessive; and (4) other institutions offering credit for graduate extension courses had taken similar action. In contrast, new degrees were added to serve the nation and the region more effectively: the Bachelor of Arts, the Bachelor of Music, the Master of Music, the Master of Science in Library Science, and the Master of Education.

Institutional cooperation with Vanderbilt University and Scarritt College was an effort to extend to the students in the academic community an opportunity to enlarge their educational experiences, and for the institutions to avert duplication of courses, thereby saving monies which were applied to other projects and offerings. Peabody, however, did not drop courses it deemed necessary to its program or that it could handle more cheaply than by purchasing them from other institutions. Beyond the interchange of classes, the major cooperation came in the formation of a unified library administration which resulted in the creation of the Joint Universities Libraries. The main library building in this complex was completed during this era.

Benefits accruing to the field of higher education

Though being a leading institution of its kind, in only two known instances during this period did Peabody participate in the creation of something of significance for the field of higher education. One was its initiation of conferences on teacher negotiations; the other was the creation of the unified library services for the institutions in the area adjacent to the college. Otherwise, Peabody adopted numerous policies, procedures, and programs that were in existence elsewhere.

Nothing new was started in the field of college administration. There was no new decision-making model, no new structure for administering the affairs of the institution, and no new innovative departmental framework. There were no problem-solving procedures developed by institutional personnel, nor was there any evidence of their having developed studies formally in this field.

Decision-making opportunity was often delegated to those in positions of responsibility in the college. There is no evidence, though, that this was done in accord with any formal decision-making structure. There is some evidence that Peabody did not practice its classroom teachings in the actual administration of the college. Campbell stated that the college taught the best and acted the worst in this area.[1]

In Garrison's day, decision-making had not become a formal study area as it has in this day. Many books have been written on the subject, but they were written for the most part later than the Garrison era. There is no evidence that the president spelled out the process by which decisions were to be made at the institution, or how problem-solving procedures were going to be determined. Presumably, no conferences were held dealing with this subject.

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

In the areas of finance, faculty, and the educational program, there were a few innovations, one being the conference on professional negotiations. Faculty were said to be innovative on some things, but there is no concrete evidence that what they created was making an impact on the educational movement of the day. Many traveled extensively with the message of educational improvement, but this was not necessarily synonymous with creativity, innovation, and change.

There was some updating of the institution's method of keeping financial records just prior to this era. To illustrate, accounting methods used by major institutions were adopted. Later, the submission of a balanced budget was made by the Garrison administration. This was an indication of the desire of the administration for financial integrity, not an indication of creativity.

Changes in curriculum offerings were sought and obtained. New degrees were added, but they were not different in kind from those already offered by other institutions of higher learning. Even the Master of Education degree, though relatively new to the area, was not new to American higher education circles. However, the glimmerings of a new program for educational trainees (the Specialist in

Education degree) appeared during the discussion of its adoption.

The creation of some divisions was new for Peabody, but their birth only paralleled that kind of educational diversification and proliferation being pursued at other institutions. No radically different kinds of divisions were formed or anticipated. Efforts were made primarily to equate the curriculum with that of other colleges; therefore, limited chances were given to experiment in curriculum development. There was no radical departure in content from that already taught, just a reorganization of academic offerings for greater effectiveness and efficiency.

A unique contribution to higher education was the establishment of the Joint University Libraries system in which Garrison played a significant part both when he was Dean of the Graduate School and Senior College and when he served as president of the college. The overt symbol of this agreement was the construction during this era of the $2,000,000.00 central library building on property deeded to the Joint University Libraries by Vanderbilt University.

The uniting of the three institutions--Peabody, Scarritt, and Vanderbilt--in this endeavor was an additional agreement to that kind of cooperation involving reciprocal credit acceptance for classes taken by students enrolled in the three institutions. A major factor for influencing the formation of the University Center was to increase the availability for scholarship and research for those who were part of the academic community. It was also hoped that money would be attracted to the area from foundations and individuals who wanted maximum returns on their gifts to higher education.

Answers to specific questions

The questions in the first chapter were posed to implement the major purpose of the study so as to reveal pertinent information about the administrative problems selected for investigation. Answers to these are listed below.

1. Under what circumstances did the institutional personnel of the era identify the problems?

Problems were most frequently identified by the president who cited them in his annual reports to the trustees, in addresses to the faculty, and in letters to friends of the institution. Many of the statements made to trustees were published in the bulletins and periodicals of the college.

Only a few records are available concerning the meetings of the academic councils, and these do not mention specific problems confronting the college. The faculty identified some problems in their meetings. These were related mostly to degree offerings and curriculum changes. They did not identify problems relating to themselves or to finances.

The trustees of the institution did not so much identify problems as they did support the president in his solution of them. They relied on his being the chief agent of their group to bring about an effective conclusion to the questions facing the college. Mostly, they accepted his recognition of problems, commented on his ability to lead in the matters attacked, and expected him to identify and solve others. The actions they took concerning his recommendations were the visible means of their support. Without these demonstrations of their backing, situations could have remained in a status quo or could have worsened.

The more critical the problem, the more likely it was to be recognized. Many problems were serious in nature, for many situations had been neglected for years, as those having reference to faculty salaries, and the proliferation of courses. It was imperative for morale purposes and for institutional effectiveness that these situations be alleviated immediately. Further, there was the need that additional complications be avoided and that problems be prohibited from enlarging. Measures enacted not only brought immediate relief but also prohibited the growth of related issues or an enlargement of those in existence.

2. What was the background of each problem?

The panoramic backdrop to all situations as they existed was composed of the depression and the war. Both events affected the monetary situation of the college, which in turn touched most problems, since most were directly or indirectly economic in nature or hinged on economic factors. A few problems involved more intangible factors such as morale and institutional loyalty.

Political overtones were lacking because the college was not embroiled in state, county, or city politics. The institution was not state-owned or governed, even though it did endeavor to provide educational leadership for public school systems. Nor did any racial, religious, or social situations form the background for problems faced by the college.

3. To whom was the responsibility for formulating each decision committed?

Most of the records did not reveal the answer to this question. Campbell generalized by stating that he had had a free hand in making recommendations in the operations of his office, but that in some decisions regarding personnel selection and appointment the relationship was limited.[1]

When problems were described as being solved, generally the administration was credited with the success attained. Credit was not given to anyone in particular; that is, personalities were not singled out for their part in providing a solution to problems. The president did not even claim credit for himself when announcing that a solution had been effected for a difficult situation.

Committees were not utilized to their fullest capabilities. An average of fourteen administrative committees were appointed yearly, but folders relating to only six were found in the presidential files. No other information about their official activities were found elsewhere. The material located did not indicate any in-depth involvement by these groups in the decision-making processes of the institution. Garrison did use two ad hoc groups for data-gathering purposes. On one occasion he cited the Graduate

---

[1] Campbell, interview.

Instruction Committee for their signal contribution to the development of the educational program.

The decision-making process of the institution started with the trustees who heard the problems identified and who then asked the president for action. They often acted on declared solutions but rarely offered a solution of their own. Most of their actions were in response to the president's identification of issues. They gave him the right to attempt to solve them. Their actions guided the administration on broad lines, but specific problem-solving actions were left to the president.

4. What other individuals or groups were relied upon for consultation or discussion?

Even as there is little information on record that reveals that the administration relied upon specific individuals in the institution for the solution of problems, there is also little or no record that the administration relied upon outside individuals or agencies for help in problem-solving.

For instance, there was no AAUP or other kind of powerful group which identified problems relating to the faculty; therefore, there was no turning to a group of this nature for advice in how to deal with faculty-administrative relationships. Though there was a strong following on the campus by members of the Progressive Education Association, this group was not called upon to offer help in time of difficulty, though members of that group might have given aid as individuals.

Despite the large role of the General Education Board in the financing of programs and projects at the college, no correspondence between the institutions was located. While it is a conclusion that the General Education Board grants were sought to allow for depth studies in selected areas of educational programming, no definite statements exist that reveal that the administration sought its aid as problem-solvers.

The president called upon the Wage Stabilization Board for permission to raise salaries; also, he negotiated with the armed forces for military units to be stationed on the campus. The latter action, in particular, resolved many financial worries of the administration. These groups, however, were not approached with the idea of their aiding in the solution even though they were a party to effective disintegration of prime issues. They were not groups which were called upon for assistance and then offered themselves as the solutions for things confronting him. Garrison used these groups as a means of meeting his problems.

On one occasion the president cited what other colleges in the state had done in reference to offering graduate credit on extension work. He referred to the rulings and desires of an academic group which offered a professional opinion on this subject. As in other instances, he did not take the problem to the conferences of deans but let their actions aid him in the solution to his own problem.

An ever-present outside force that influenced the decisions made at Peabody was the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The fact that the accrediting agency demanded certain standards not only posed potential problems for accreditation purposes but also was the solution for some. By meeting these standards some potential problems were averted. Garrison never used the association as either a whipping-boy or as a saviour of the institution. Present records of the Southern Association contain no correspondence between the college and the accreditating agency's officers dated in the era under investigation. Other records state that the college was first accredited in 1915 and remained accredited through this period.[1] This implies that there was a constant adherence to at least minimal standards for accreditation.

5. What data were utilized in arriving at solutions?

Most data were assembled by the president for his use in presenting problems. A prime example is his citation of class offerings and enrollment in 1937 and 1938. Other data were collected by committees and used by the president and others. Committee data were presented frequently at faculty meetings for use in their deliberations, although ad hoc faculty committees reported directly to the president. With the advent of infrequent faculty meetings, less information was sent through this body or gathered by it. Indeed, the reduction in the number of faculty meetings probably precluded the reporting of pertinent information either to that group or to the president.

The president did assemble facts for his reports to the Board. This was especially true of financial matters. He used these facts to back up his contention of the presence of problems. There is, however, more of a reporting of data than there is the presence in records of data on which the reports were based. Data on enrollment were available, but data on the need for expansion of some course offerings in some areas were not in evidence.

---

[1] Conversation at the office of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, October 11, 1966.

6. What was the rationale for the solutions derived?

There were two overriding reasons why solutions were attempted: the financial reason and the enrollment reason. Most monies utilized by the college in meeting its needs came from endowment, tuition collections, and activities related to student enrollment. Small amounts came from gifts and scholarships. In a sense, therefore, every decision was related to the financial ability of the college to sustain itself. Though many reasons might have been given for the demise of certain projects and programs, it was really the potential financial loss that determined solutions.

Vitally related to this was the enrollment. Without student tuition and fees, money available amounted to a small part of annual needs. The activities and plans of the college were determined by how much money was available yearly. As there were few advance notices of what size student population to expect, the college had to wait until most monies were on hand. Endowment could be counted upon for specified amounts, but it increasingly contributed a smaller per cent to the total yearly budget. When enrollment diminished, funds were lower and programs and activities of the college had to be curtailed. This led to such practices as not replacing departed members of the faculty.

The establishment of the degree programs for majors in Home Economics and Music, respectively, and the creation of the Master of Education degree brought added expense to an already burdened budget. Home Economics and Music demanded more equipment than the average department for the teaching-learning process. Course offerings had to be expanded to care for the majors who would be entering the programs. Such offerings also meant that more personnel would have to be hired to teach them.

For a while the Home Economics program was successful, but the numbers dwindled with decreased enrollment in the college. Music, however, was successful in its attempt to gain more students through new degree offerings and increased course offerings. The enrollment increased to a point where this department sustained the third largest enrollment in the school. Those receiving degrees in this field did not increase in proportion to the enrollment increase, however. In fact, no one received the Bachelor of Music degree during this time; only three received the newly established Master of Music degree.

The Master of Education degree, designed to be a professional degree beyond the Master of Arts, added to the costs of running the educational program. This meant, at least theoretically, that there were more educational program expenditures in the form of additional courses on the graduate level, enlarged teaching loads, and more counseling roles for faculty members. However, it was felt that the anticipated enrollment would offset the increased costs of offering the degree. It brought in only a few enrollees who were graduated with the degree.

The offerings for the new degree were increased because of Peabody's commitment to educational betterment. This new degree tied in with the effort to upgrade the offerings to its educational constituents. Because the purpose of Peabody was to speed educational enlightenment, the administration and faculty structured the institutional programs so as to accomplish these designs. Morally, the question arose as to which was better--to save money or to offer the constituents better courses and an opportunity to advance professionally. Peabody chose the latter course.

7. How successfully were the solutions implemented?

Statements in the preceding chapters show that most solutions were successfully implemented within the scope of objectives. That is, the solutions decided upon were attempted and were the ones that brought the problems under control. Such implementation resulted either in the termination of issues or in their being arrested.

The following solutions were achieved in a brief period of time after they were posed:

1. The raising of the percentage of endowment funds to be used in purchasing stocks.
2. The obtaining of a military unit for the campus.
3. The restoration of salaries of clerical and maintenance personnel in the college.
4. The paring of administrative costs.
5. The establishment of a tenure policy.
6. Not replacing departed faculty after the advent of the era of low enrollment.
7. The formation of a Committee on Student Enrollment.
8. The termination of graduate credit for extension courses.

Solutions which took longer to implement were the following:

1. The restoration of the salaries of some of the college faculty members.

2. The settlement of bond defaults at lower rates.
3. The increasing of the institution's working capital.
4. The retiring of indebtedness and bills.
5. The securing of payments on loans made to students.
6. The gathering of all business operations under the supervision of the president.
7. The initiation of better office procedures regarding the management and control of the financial processes of the college.
8. The equipping and re-equipping of academic departments.
9. The establishment of the retirement and annuity plans.
10. The obtaining of faculty support for the educational program.
11. The elimination of courses with combined low enrollments and high costs.
12. The reorganization of academic departments.
13. The upgrading of student scholarship.
14. The termination of the Experimental Junior College.
15. The addition of new degrees.
16. The increasing of inter-institutional cooperation.

8. What problems remained unsolved?

Though it can be concluded that problems related to finance, faculty, and the educational program persist in every era in every institution of higher learning, the Garrison administration was successful in its day in coping with specific problems within these large classifications. Some it faced, however, persisted into the administration of Henry H. Hill. They concerned the following:

1. The salaries of some faculty members of the college and all of the teachers in the Demonstration School.

2. The maintenance of buildings and grounds.

3. The business office procedures that related to the president's office and a weakness in staff abilities to fulfill responsibilities.

4. The development of the faculty, particularly with reference to morale and the securing of teaching personnel.

Implications

The following implications, relative to the findings and the conclusions drawn from the literature, interviews, and other data are deemed appropriate to this study.

1. If greater numbers of the faculty had been involved in the decision-making process of the college, there would have been more creative ways of dealing with the problems of the institution. Involving them would have meant that programs would not have been indiscriminately abandoned or projected. If their participation had been considered vital to the governance of the college, they could have taken extensive action on pressing issues and participated in the implementation of chosen solutions.

Faculty should be involved in the governance of colleges in order to preserve democratic principles, as well as to get the broadest amount of expert opinion concerning the possible solution of perplexing questions. Faculty meetings are necessary to preserve the unity of the group and to demonstrate their powers as a deliberative body. Morale of academic bodies is maintained in direct proportion to their being used in the governance of the affairs that affect them. Apart from their desire to do so, faculty members should be asked to share in the problem-solving responsibilities because of the heaviness of administrative burdens. Faculty members may have limited conceptions of the principles for planning the total curricular experience and little knowledge of the implications of their own decisions on the budget of an institution, but they should be allowed to participate at least in the determination of the curriculum and the framing of the instructional practices of colleges.

2. There is a parallel between the era under consideration and today's developing crises in relation to the Vietnam War. The recent changing of the draft guidelines reflects the need of the military forces to replace men who entered service two years ago during the first build-up and who are now completing their tours of duty. New policy states that older students will be drafted first. Eligible for induction will be students who have completed their first year of graduate work, those completing their advanced degrees, and students receiving their baccalaureate degrees. Current provisions call for induction at the end of the current school year. If a student passes the summer without being drafted, there is no guarantee that he will be able to complete a semester or quarter if he is called up in the middle of the year.

Exempted from the call-up will be those enrolled in medicine, dentistry, and allied fields, and those graduate students in their second year of study. Undergraduates are to be deferred with certain limitations as to age and normal progress in college. Removed from the list of previously exempted fields are those classified "essential activities" and "critical occupations" under which students in non-transferable occupational programs in junior colleges have been deferred. A local draft board, however, can grant a deferment to a person whom it deems necessary to the welfare of the community.

Under these conditions, it will be difficult to predict registration figures for graduate and professional schools. Enrollment may be limited to women, veterans, men physically disqualified, and those over the age twenty-five. Institutions can probably expect a drop of from one-third to 70 per cent of their graduate students over a two-year period. If a random selection system is adopted, as some advocate, to replace the new plan, undergraduate enrollment would be affected adversely and the pressure on graduate schools lessened.

Aside from the enrollment problem there will be an effect upon the supply of teaching and research assistants. This would be unfavorable to the training of adequate numbers of teachers and professors for the nation's colleges and universities, as well as for other positions demanding graduate school training.

Also feeling the brunt of this decision would be those faced with the task of assigning faculty loads. Older members of the faculty would likely be abandoning or limiting research programs to teach more classes. Larger classes, especially for undergraduates, would result with the possibility of an accompanying lowering of the quality of teaching.

Another impact would be on budgetary allocations. Operational costs would increase because of commitments to faculty members. Institutions would have a difficult time replacing the low-paid, but vitally needed, graduate students. Any replacements would conceivably be full-time personnel whose base salary demands would be much higher individually and in the aggregate than those of graduate students.

There is also the possibility that standards would be lowered to fill graduate school vacancies. Major graduate schools could vote to accept applicants who otherwise might not have been admitted. This, in turn, would intensify problems at institutions with smaller graduate enrollments.

3. While both private and public institutions of higher learning will be affected by draft policies, public institutions face uncertainty over the amounts of tax funds

they will receive in the face of the enlarging military commitment in Vietnam. If financing the war causes money to be diverted from higher education, administrators will have to practice austerity and will need to make decisions about financial policy that will affect the educational programs of their schools.

Administrators are also confronted with the revolt against rising taxes. A breaking point has arrived for some who have said that they refuse to pay part of their income taxes in protest against the conflict in Southeast Asia. There is as much concern about raising current property taxes as there is continued debate about adding a suggested 10 per cent surtax on all income in order to support the war and the poverty-prevention programs. Some congressmen claim that this amount is not enough to supply funds for the dual needs, whereas others have stated that they will not vote for any taxation which is not preceded by a decided cut in non-defense spending.

Already there has been a curtailment in the amounts allocated by the federal government's Department of Housing and Urban Affairs for college student housing for the fiscal year 1968. New restrictions reduce the maximum amount of loans from the previous level and impose new limits upon unit costs allowed.[1] There have also been funding cuts for grants and loans for academic facilities. Paralleling this has been the raising of interest rates for the financing of those buildings for which loans have been extended.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings, conclusions, and the implications, the following recommendations are made:

1. Peabody should devote its energy and endowments primarily to the training of students for the profession of teaching.

2. The institution should develop a substantially stronger base of financial support among foundations, alumni, and friends.

3. There should be a sustained and increased effort on the part of the college to cooperate more fully with other institutions in the University Center so as to avoid duplication of courses, positions, and facilities, and in order to effect savings which could be used for furthering the advancement of the educational opportunities of participants in the academic community.

---

[1] American Council on Education, Higher Education and National Affairs, XVII, No. 9 (March 3, 1968).

A permanent committee, fashioned after that of the Joint University Libraries system, should be formed to achieve this objective. Cooperation should involve administrators at the highest levels of institutional responsibilities in order to ensure the continuity of policies established and to guarantee the carrying out of decisions made.

4. What data for this study that were available on the campus could not be found in any one place. Material was located in the vault of the Administration Building, in the archives and vault of the Peabody Library, in the office of the president, and in a maintenance building. These materials should be gathered at one place and catalogued so as to enlarge their usefulness and to ensure their permanence. People with important records relating to this study should be encouraged to deposit them with the archives so that they can be made accessible for research purposes.

Suggestions for Further Studies

There was one major purpose in this study. This paper has been dedicated to fulfilling that purpose. The study has suggested numerous other projects that cannot be contained herein and that are not within the purview of this paper. It is recommended that other scholars pursue these.

The author suggests that studies be made encompassing the following subjects: (1) institutional cooperation in college and university centers with projections concerning future cooperative ventures; (2) the kinds of cooperation that are possible among the institutions in the Nashville area; and (3) the influence of the General Education Board on Southern higher education.

Specific investigations about Peabody College that could be made include the following: (1) periods in Peabody's history not previously analyzed (1786-1809, the era of Thomas B. Craighead, former president of Davidson Academy and of Cumberland College; 1809-21, the era of James B. Priestly, then president of Cumberland College; and 1870-75, the era of General Edmund Kirby Smith, former Chancellor of the University of Nashville); (2) biographies of eminent members of the faculty; (3) the role of the college in the education of the Negro; (4) the contribution of the Division of Surveys and Field Studies as an agent of change in public education; and (5) the role of the Demonstration School as an adjunct to the teacher training program of the college and as a laboratory for educational research. When sufficient time has elapsed, studies could be made of the presidency of Henry H. Hill (1945-61) and that of Felix Robb (1961-66).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Baird, James O. The Life and Works of Charles Edgar Little. Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 404. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1949.

Beasley, Wallis. The Life and Educational Contributions of James D. Porter. Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 405. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1950.

Bishop, Morris. A History of Cornell. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Brittain, M. L. The Story of Georgia Tech. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.

Crabb, Alfred Leland. The Genealogy of George Peabody College for Teachers: Covering a Period of One Hundred and Fifty Years. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1935.

________. The Historical Background of Peabody College Covering a Period of One Hundred and Fifty-five Years. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941.

Diekhoff, John S. The Domain of the Faculty in Our Expanding Colleges. New York: Harper and Bros., 1956.

Dressel, Paul L. The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

Frankel, Charles (ed.). Issues in University Education. New York: Harper and Bros., 1959.

French, John C. A History of the University Founded by Johns Hopkins. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946.

Kuhlman, A. H. (ed.). The Development of University Centers in the South. Nashville: The Peabody Press and the Vanderbilt University Press, 1942.

McLeod, John Angus. From These Stones: Mars Hill College, The First One Hundred Years. Mars Hill College: 1955.

Parker, Franklin. George Peabody, 1785-1869, Founder of Modern Philanthropy. Abstract of dissertation. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1955.

Parks, Joseph Howard. General Edmund Kirby Smith, C.S.A. Southern Biography Series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1954.

Pierson, George Wilson. Yale College: An Educational History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

Poret, George Cleveland. The Contributions of William Howard Payne to Public Education. Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 81. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Russell, John Dale. The Finance of Higher Education. Rev. ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Shapiro, Jacob W. Growth of a Philosophy: Hanor A. Webb. Nashville: Bureau of Publications, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963.

Taylor, Hoy. An Interpretation of the Early Administration of the Peabody Education Fund. Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 114. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1933.

The Semicentennial of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1875-1925. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1925.

Waffle, Eugene Melville. Eben Sperry Stearns: Pioneer in American Education. Abstract of Dissertation. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1940.

Wilson, Logan. The Academic Man. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1954.

Windrow, John Edwin. John Berrien Lindsley: Educator, Physician, Social Reformer. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1938.

________. The Life and Works of John Berrien Lindsley. Abstract of Dissertation. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1938.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

U.S. Army Air Force. Historical Report: 333rd AAF CTD (AC). Vol. II: Appendix. 1943.

C. ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

American Council on Education. Higher Education and National Affairs, XVII, No. 9 (March 3, 1968).

Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers. Vols. XXVI-XXXIV. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937-45.

"Correspondence-Study Courses," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXVIII (March, 1939), 6-15; XXXIV (January, 1945), 5-15.

"Courses of Instruction," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXVI (March, 1937), 46-148.

Garrison, Sidney Clarence. "Gifts, Bequests, and Memorials," The Peabody Reflector and Alumni News, XII (May, 1939), 163.

________. "Student Loans, Scholarships, and Fellowships," The Peabody Reflector and Alumni News, XII (April, 1939), 125.

________. "To the Peabody Alumni," The Peabody Reflector, XVII (September, 1944), 323.

Henry, David D. "A History of Cornell," The Journal of Higher Education, XXIV (April, 1963), 235.

Kuhlman, A. F. "Program of the Joint University Libraries," The Peabody Reflector, XV (January, 1942), 15-17.

"The Child Study Clinic," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXXI (September, 1942).

"The Demonstration and Experimental Schools," Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers, XXXI (April, 1942), 19.

"The Institute of Professional Relations," The Peabody Journal of Education, XVIII (September, 1940), 66.

"The Joint University Libraries," The Peabody Reflector, XV (January, 1942), 37.

"The Peabody Institute on Professional Relations," The Journal of the National Education Association, XXVIII (October, 1938), 199-200.

The Peabody Journal of Education. Vols. XV-XXIII. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937-45.

The Peabody Reflector. Vols. XV-XVIII. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941-45.

The Peabody Reflector and Alumni News. Vols. X-XIII. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937-40.

"The Purpose of the Experimental Junior College," *Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers*, XXVI August, 1937), 5-6.

"The Three Year Professional Unit," *Bulletin, George Peabody College for Teachers*, XXX (March, 1940), 26.

Wilson, Louis B. "The Significance of the University Libraries," *The Peabody Reflector*, XV (January, 1942), 15-17.

D. REPORTS

General Education Board. *Annual Report*. 1937-1937, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942-1951.

________. *Review and Final Report, 1902-1964*. New York: General Education Board, 1964.

George Peabody College for Teachers. *Annual Report of the President to the Board of Trustees*. 1937-1944, 1946.

________. *Report of the Acting President to the Board of Trustees*. 1945.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Bailey, Carrie. "The Life and Work of Lucy Gage, Pioneer Teacher and Leader." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960.

Brouillette, Joseph Walter. "The Third Phase of the Peabody Education Fund, 1904-1914." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 280. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Chambers, Gurney. "The Educational Philosophy of John Michael Demiaskevich." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 708. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1967.

Cochrane, Robert M. "Fletcher Bascom Dresslar: His Life and Works." Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 46. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1955.

Cowgill, Lenna Adele. "Thomas B. Craighead--Minister, Educator." Typewritten theme, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Cullum, Edward Neeley. "George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1927." Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 231. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963.

Evans, George Keiser. "The American Career of John Michael Demiaskevich." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 568. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

George Peabody College for Teachers. The Papers of Sidney Clarence Garrison.

________. Minutes of the Meetings of the Board of Trustees. 1935-1950. (Typewritten.)

________. Minutes of the Meetings of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. 1935-1950. (Typewritten.)

________. Minutes of the Meetings of the Faculty. Vols. VI-VII. 1937-1941. (Typewritten.)

Long, Howard O. "A Biography of Professor William Knox Tate: Southern 'Educational Engineer.'" Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 466. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1952.

McCann, Bess. "The Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1914-1936." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1936.

Morgan, Kenimer Houze. "The University of Nashville: 1825-1850." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 575. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960.

Parker, Franklin. "George Peabody, 1785-1869, Founder of Modern Philanthropy." Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 70. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956.

Peck, Richard Connally. "Jabez Lamar Monroe Curry, Educational Crusader." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 228. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1942.

Robert, Edward Bane. "The Administration of the Peabody Education Fund from 1880-1905." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 225. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1936.

Roemer, Joseph. "The Curriculum of the University of Nashville." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1915.

Stokes, Elizabeth H. "The Peabody Child Study Center." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956.

Swanson, Harvey Guy. "A Type Study in Biography: George Peabody." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennesse, 1917.

"The Inauguration of S. C. Garrison as Fifth President of the College." Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1938.

Waffle, Eugene Melville. "Eben Sperry Stearns: Pioneer in American Education." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 253. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1939.

West, Earle Huddleston. "The Life and Educational Contributions of Barnas Sears." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 601. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.

Windrow, John Edwin. "The Life and Works of John Berrien Lindsley." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 231. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

F. NEWSPAPERS

Scrapbooks of the News Bureau, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee. 1937-1939.

The Nashville Banner. 1937-1945.

The Nashville Tennessean. 1937-1945.

G. OTHER SOURCES

George Peabody College for Teachers. Personal interviews held from May 12, 1967-July 19, 1967, with present and former administrators, faculty members, trustees, and staff personnel who served during the years 1937-45.

Letter from Flora M. Rhind, Special Assistant to the President, the Rockefeller Foundation, New York City, New York, February 14, 1967.

Letter from Mary McNulty, Bursar, George Peabody College for Teachers, May 19, 1967.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION, 1937-1945

APPENDIX A

OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION, 1937-1945[a]

	'37	'38	'39	'40	'41	'42	'43	'44	'45
Appleton, Roy									
Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Brewton, John E.									
Dean of the Graduate School						x	x	x	
Acting President									x
Campbell, Doak S.									
Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Director of the Senior College		x	x	x	x				
Carr, Ida Z.									
Student Counselor	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Frost, Norman									
Director of Extension	x								
Garrison, S. C.									
Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Director of the Senior College	x	x							
Acting President	x								
President	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Hill, Henry H.									
President									b

	'37	'38	'39	'40	'41	'42	'43	'44	'45
Johnson, Freida									
Advisor to Junior and Senior College Students	x	x	x	x	x				
Advisor to Students						x			
Jones, W. C.									
Dean of the Graduate School								x	x
Kuhlman, A. F.									
Director of Joint University Libraries	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Little, Charles E.									
Honorary Acting President	x								
McBride, Otis									
Alumni Secretary	x	x	x	x	x	c	c	c	c
Miles, J. R.									
Bursar								x	x
Muncie, Virginia									
Acting Dean of Women							x	x	x
Payne, Bruce Ryburn									
President	d								
Robinson, J. R.									
Registrar	x	x							
Director of Admissions			x	x	x	x	x	x	x

	'37	'38	'39	'40	'41	'42	'43	'44	'45
Roemer, Joseph									
Dean of the Experimental Junior College and Director of the Demonstration School	x	x	x	x	x				
Dean of the College						x	x	x	x
Sensing, Thurman									
Business Manager and Assistant Treasurer	x	x	x						
Business Manager				x	x	x			
Smith, S. L.									
Director of Public Relations		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Windrow, John Edwin									
Alumni Secretary	x								
Director of Demonstration School								x	x

---

[a] Source: Bulletin, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

[b] Succeeded Garrison as president, September 1, 1945.

[c] In the armed forces.

[d] Preceded Garrison as president.

APPENDIX B

IDENTIFICATION LIST

Anderson, A. Edwin, Professor of English, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Armstrong, Louis E., Assistant Professor of Political Science, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Bishop, B. L., Chattanooga, Tennessee; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Breme, Walter M., Clarksville, Tennessee: Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Brewton, John E., Professor of English, Emeritus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Campbell, Doak S., President Emeritus, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Carpenter, C. C., Dean, Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, North Carolina; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Crabb, A. L., Professor of Education, Emeritus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Crider, Mrs. J. O., Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania; Alumna, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Dunkerly, Robert, Dalton, Georgia; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Eaves, William M., Regional Director, Wage and Hour and Publication Contract Division, Nashville, Tennessee.

Fjellstrom, R. J., Buy American, Inc., Oakland, California.

Frost, Norman, Professor of Rural Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Garrison, S. C., President, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Greer, Helen Smith, Lancaster, Kentucky; Alumna, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Haddox, Clara, Assistant Professor of Physical Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Hill, H. G., Sr., Nashville, Tennessee; Trustee, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Hill, Henry H., President, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Holden, B. S., Instructor in History, Demonstration School, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Hunt, C. B., Dean of the Graduate School, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Leathers, W. S., School of Medicine, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Lively, C. J., Regional Head, Salary Stabilization Unit, Atlanta, Georgia.

McBride, Otis, Professor of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

McCuistion, Fred, Little Rock, Arkansas; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

McKellar, Kenneth D., United States Senator from Tennessee.

McNulty, Mary, Bursar, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Martin, W. B., Parker School District, Greenville, South Carolina; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Metcalf, Harlan G., Professor of Health and Physical Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Mikell, H. J., President of the Board of Trustees, George Peabody College for Teachers; Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Atlanta, Georgia.

Minor, H. D., Judge, Memphis, Tennessee.

Napier, T. H., Alabama College, Montevallo, Alabama.

Nicholas, Louis T., Associate Professor of Voice, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Payne, Bruce Ryburn, President, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Pigford, C. E., Jackson, Tennessee; Member of the Board of Trustees, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Potts, Aurelia B., Professor of Nursing Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Priest, J. Percy, Nashville, Tennessee; Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District, State of Tennessee.

Pritchett, Margaret, Administrative Assistant, Office for Student Aid, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Reeves, Lillian, Barnesville, Georgia; Alumna, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Rhind, Flora M., Special Assistant to the President, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York City, New York.

Robinson, J. R., Professor of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Rogers, Laurence T., Professor of Health and Physical Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Sanders, Jennings B., President, Memphis State College, Memphis, Tennessee.

Slote, Dorothy A., Director of Physical Education for Women, North Park College, Chicago, Illinois; Alumna, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Southall, Maycie K., Professor of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Stokes, Walter S., Nashville, Tennessee; Member of the Board of Trustees, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Stretch, Lorena, Professor of Education, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Tolleson, Dorothy, Assistant Professor of Physical Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Walker, Bradley, Nashville, Tennessee; Attorney for the Board of Trustees, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Webb, Hanor A., Professor of Chemistry, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Weisinger, Kendall, Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company, Atlanta, Georgia.

Whitaker, J. R., Professor of Geography, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Williams, D. M., Bowling Green, Kentucky; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Windrow, John E., Professor of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Wolfe, Irving W., Professor of Music, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Wren, F. L., Professor of Mathematics, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Young, T. C., Nashville, Tennessee; Alumnus, George Peabody College for Teachers.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW LETTERS

The committee assigned to guide my graduate work has approved my dissertation proposal. The purpose of the study is the following:

> . . . to discuss selected administrative problems faced by George Peabody College for Teachers during the years 1937-1945, to examine their solutions, and to establish what benefits accrued to the study of the field of higher education as a result of their identification and solution.

More narrowly, this research project will concentrate on the problems and solutions related to finance, curricular offerings, and the faculty.

Because you were associated with Peabody during this era, I am requesting permission to have an interview with you to discuss problems and solutions related to the above areas. Any statement you make will be treated confidentially and no statement will be included in the dissertation without your written authorization.

There are numerous people whom I am seeking to interview; therefore, it has been necessary for me to send this mimeographed letter and reply form. Thank you for understanding.

If you have any unpublished materials that you would let me read, I would appreciate having the opportunity to do so.

Yours truly,

John Petry
Box 190, Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

The committee assigned to guide my graduate work has approved my dissertation proposal. The purpose of the study is the following:

> . . . to discuss selected administrative problems faced by George Peabody College for Teachers during the years 1937-1945, to examine their solutions, and to establish what benefits accrued to the study of the field of higher education as a result of their identification and solution.

More narrowly, this research project will concentrate on the problems and solutions related to finance, curriculum, and faculty.

Because you were associated with Peabody during this era, would you write me any impressions you have concerning the above areas, their problems and solutions? Any statement you make will be treated confidentially and no statement will be included in the dissertation without your written consent.

Problems I have been able to identify in finance are those dealing with salaries, endowment management, maintenance, and reorganization of the business office. Those dealing with the curriculum include enrollment, curtailment of courses, establishment of new divisions, the addition of new degree programs, and cooperation with other institutions in the area. Faculty problems include instructional effectiveness, retention of personnel, replacement of losses, and increasing financial security.

There are numerous people from whom I am seeking information; therefore, it has been necessary for me to send this mimeographed letter. Thank you for understanding.

Sincerely,

John Petry
Box 190, Peabody
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Thank you for granting me the opportunity to talk to you about problems faced by Peabody College during the period 1937-1945. Soon I will be contacting you asking you for a definite appointment time.

In order to record more accurately what is said I want to bring along a tape recorder. In accordance with an earlier statement, nothing will be quoted concerning our conversation without authorization from you.

During the interview I would like to talk to you about some of the following problems I have been able to identify from material that I have read:

(1) those dealing with finance:
    a. adjustment of salaries
    b. improvement of endowment management
    c. maintenance and equipment
    d. reorganization of the business office
    e. establishing a financial reserve

(2) those dealing with curriculum:
    a. curtailment of courses
    b. changing enrollments
    c. establishment of new divisions
    d. addition of new degree programs
    e. cooperation within the academic community

(3) those dealing with the faculty:
    a. instructional effectiveness
    b. retention of the teaching personnel
    c. replacing faculty
    d. increasing financial security

Because of your closeness to Peabody, you will in all likelihood be able to identify problems not listed above which we can discuss.

Sincerely,

John Petry
Box 190, Peabody
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

In 1967 it was my privilege to interview you concerning my dissertation, "A Study of Selected Administrative Problems of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937-1945."

In an earlier letter to you I stated that any statement that you made to me during the interview would be treated confidentially and that no statement would be included in the dissertation without your written permission.

Attached to this letter are Xerox copies of pages which contain quotations from my interview with you. These were transcribed from the tape on which our conversation was recorded.

I wish to include this material in the final copy to be submitted to my major professor. Would you give me your written permission to include this in my paper?

Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your reply. If you have questions about the context I will be happy to answer them. Because the dissertation needs to be typed in its final form in March, it would be most helpful for you to let me hear from you by February 21.

My deepest gratitude is extended to you for your cooperation in the formation and completion of this study.

Sincerely,

John Petry
2949 Clearbrook
Memphis, Tennessee 38118

APPENDIX D

STUDIES ABOUT PEABODY COLLEGE

NOT RELATED TO THIS STUDY

Adams, Mary Joyce. "Modified Behaviour of Five-Year Old Children, Peabody Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Amos, Junia Broadus. "Opportunities Afforded Student Teachers to Study Children in Teacher-Training Institutions." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1938.

Bagwell, Theo Leola. "A Study in Measuring Taste in Peabody Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1929.

Baker, Frances Elizabeth. "Opinions Regarding the Entrance of Women in Industrial Arts Education." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1938.

Barlow, James Forace. "Subject Bibliography of M.A. Theses in the Department of Physical Education of George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1938.

Barnes, Essa May. "Uses Made of Nursery Schools by Universities and Colleges." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1936.

Bates, Mrs. John L. "Relation of Dental to Other Physical Findings: Peabody Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Benson, LaVonn Marceil. "A Report on the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1962.

Bostwick, Verna Mae. "The Aetiology of Underachieving Freshmen and Sophomores in Peabody College." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956.

Bottum, Frances Ranney. "Plant Invasion at Knapp Farm." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1926.

Boyce, Leta. "A Study of Resistant Responses in Peabody Nursery School Children." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Burris, Marcella Mays. "A Report on the Independent Study Project Undertaken in Connection with Training for Teaching College Freshman English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

Calhoun, Margaret Dean. "Administrative Control of Southern Teachers College Libraries Through Faculty Committees." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1933.

Cargo, William Dale. "A Report of the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College Freshman English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963.

Carter, Catherine De Moss. "Unguided Food Selection of Men and Women Patronizing the Peabody Cafeteria." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1938.

Cline, Rodney. The Life and Work of Seaman A. Knapp. Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 183. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1936.

Clutch, Beatrice Martha. "A Health Education Program in a Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

_________. "A Testing Program in Public Health Nursing Education." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1948.

Crook, Compton. "The Birds of Peabody Campus." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1933.

Denney, Charles Crockett. "Peabody Demonstration School in the Light of Standard Tests." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1917.

Dillon, Betty Rose. "The Relationship of Interest and Personality Factors to College Marks." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1943.

Dixon, Mary Vista. "The Place of Drafting and Design in Teachers Colleges." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1932.

Donnell, A. M. "A Soil Survey of the Demonstration Farm Owned and Operated by the Knapp School of Country Life of George Peabody College for Teachers, No. II." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1921.

Drummond, Edna Catherine. "Evaporation Rates in Different Strata of the Vegetation of the Peabody Campus." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1931.

Duncan, Ruth B. "A History of George Peabody College Library, 1785-1910." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1940.

Eliason, Jane Gordon. "Present Practices Regarding Student Teaching in Four Year Teachers Colleges." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1935.

Ellis, Flora May. "Certain Measurements of College Women Specializing in Physical Education." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Fitzgibbon, Helen. "Ecology of the Woody Plants of Knapp Farm." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1926.

Flintom, Margaret Anne. "Subject Bibliography of M.A. Theses in the Department of Elementary Education of George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1928.

Frazier, John Martin. "Study of the Flat-Headed Apple-Tree Borers in Knapp Farm Orchard." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1929.

French, Jessie Lee. "Comparison of Biological Courses Offered by Institutions of Higher Education." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1928.

Garrison, Stella Whaley. "Health Knowledge of Peabody Students." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

George Peabody College. Publications of the Faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers, 1929-1934. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1934.

________. Master's Theses on Industrial Subjects. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1934.

Gotten, Julia Bragg. "Woody Vegetation of Peabody Campus." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1931.

Graham, Helen. "A Comparative Study of Home Economics Courses in Southern Colleges, Part II." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1925.

Gregory, John Willis. "A Report Reviewing an Independent Study Made of the Humanities Programs at Eight Colleges." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1955.

Hagar, Alice. "Reading Interests of Peabody Demonstration School Junior High Boys and Girls." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1957.

Hamer, Louise Oakes. "A Permanent Record Form for Students of Teacher Training Institutions." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1933.

Hard, Ruby Maude. "Training of Elementary Education Majors." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1932.

Harrison, Joann. "A Report on the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

Hart, Anna Boss. "A Survey of Materials Relating to Student Teaching." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1949.

Haven, Mary Ann. "Survey of Master's Theses in Elementary Education, Peabody College, 1928-1936." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1936.

Hazelwood, Bob J. "A Statement Concerning the Independent Study Project Undertaken in Conjunction with a Program for the Ed. S." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1959.

Hearn, Dave M., Jr. "A Report on the Selected Field Experiences for School Administrators Involved in a Pre-Service Training Program." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1959.

Hedges, William D. "Doctoral Candidates at George Peabody College for Teachers, 1919-1950." Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 99. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

Hicks, Ernest Henry. "Peabody Revision of the Yerkes-Rossy Point Scale." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1927.

Hook, Sister Mary Regien. "Kindergarten Experiences Which Contribute to Reading Readiness." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Hunt, Rolfe Lanier. "Subject Bibliography of Peabody School Administration Theses." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1927.

Jarrett, Robert Patton. "Evaluation of Students for Purposes of the Appointment Committee." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1917.

Judd, Cornelius D. The Summer School as an Agency for the Training of Teachers in the United States. Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 3. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1921.

Key, C. L. "A Soil Survey of the Demonstration Farm Owned and Operated by the Knapp School of Country Life of George Peabody College for Teachers, No. III." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1921.

Kobasigawa, Akira. "A Study of Two Predictors of Academic Success of Foreign Students at Peabody College." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956.

Larson, Mary Linaj. "A Consideration of the Teaching of an Undergraduate Course in General Linguistics at George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1965.

Legg, Fannie Carroll. "Common Insects of the Shade Trees of Peabody Campus." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1939.

Leonard, Sallie M. "A Critical Analysis of the Teaching of Spelling in the Demonstration of George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1928.

Lesley, John Boyd. "M.A. Theses in School Administration, Peabody College, 1927-1937." Unpublished Master's Thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Lewis, Mary Elizabeth. "A Comparative Survey of Health Services in Five Teachers Colleges." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1953.

Liggett, Sara Katherine. "Plants in Relation to Erosion on Knapp Farm." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1926.

Martin, Minnie Sheffield. "A Record of Art Instruction, Sixth Grade, Peabody Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1930.

Masengill, John Paul. "Developing a Comprehensive Arts Program for the Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1947.

Meeks, Elizabeth E. "An Enriched Program in Appreciation of Literature for College Sophomores." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1939.

Monroe, Albert Loomis. "Survey of Master's Theses in Secondary Education at Peabody College." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1931.

Moore, C. A. "Instructional Units in Industrial Arts for the Peabody Demonstration School." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1934.

Moseley, Eugenia F. "A Comparison of Business Education Requirements for the Baccalaureate Degree in Teacher-Training Institutions and State Certification Requirements in Business Education." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1952.

Myers, Braly Sullivan. "The Water Holding Capacity of Knapp Farm Soils." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1934.

O'Dell, Topsy Elizabeth. "A Standard System for Numbering College Courses." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1938.

Page, Charles Harold. "Guides for the Student Teacher." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1950.

Parker, John W. "A Statement Governing the Independent Study Project Undertaken in Connection with a Program for the Ed. S." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1960.

Parks, Vernon Russell. "The Library Science Curricula in Southern Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1952.

Patton, Elizabeth Royal. "A Report of the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963.

Petty, L. E. "A Soil Survey of the Demonstration Farm Owned and Operated by the Knapp School of Country Life of the George Peabody College for Teachers, No. I." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1920.

Rawls, Avondale. "The Prediction of Course Marks in the Experimental Junior College." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1939.

Richardson, Edgar M. "A Statement Concerning the Independent Study Project Undertaken in Conjunction with a Program for the Ed. S. Degree." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.

Roberts, Mames Brodie. "Inbreeding Practiced in Appointing College and University Teachers and Administrators." Peabody Contribution to Education, Number 345. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1943.

Robertson, Delmas T. "Analysis of Factors Which Influence Students to Become Biology Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1956.

Robinette, Charles Van Buren. "Ground Beetles in Relation to Agriculture Practice on Knapp Farm." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1926.

Roe, George Stewart. "The Arts: A Brochure of the Arts, George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1951.

Ross, Marjorie Ruth. "The Weeds of Knapp Farm." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1924.

Sandhu, Joginder Sing. "A Comparative Study of Instruction in the Field of English in the Colleges and Universities of India and America." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.

Selby, Frances Parlette. "Changes in Student's Schedules in George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1930.

Setliff, Ernest G. "A Hydometric Determination of Soil Colloids. Knapp Farm Soil Studies Number IV." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1928.

Shock, Lillian Irene. "The Demand Made Upon George Peabody College for Teachers for Its Product." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1920.

Shook, Mary S. "A Study of Peabody Women Graduates." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1928.

Shores, Geraldine Urist. "The Relationship of Transcript Marks Received at Peabody College." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1935.

Smith, Pauline Katherine. "A College Health Program." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1940.

Smith, Ruth Eloise. "Record Keeping in the Nursery Schools of Institutions Training Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1938.

Springer, Patricia. "Bibliography of Historical Material of Tennessee in Nashville Libraries." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1930.

Stroud, Annie Ruth. "A Report on a One-Man Show in Art." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1958.

Summerland, Samuel A. "A Survey of Insect Pests of the Knapp Farm Orchard." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1926.

Tant, Harriett. "A Report on the Independent Study." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1959.

Tilford, Bess. "The Use of the Individual Conference in Educating Student Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Trice, Ethel Preston. "The Influence of George Peabody College for Teachers on Physical Education in Southern Colleges." Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 169. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.

Vaden, James. "Distribution of the Grades at George Peabody College for Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1931.

Walkins, Lilla Ermine. "Independent Study for the Specialist in Education Degree." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1959.

Watkins, Shirley Conaster. "An Intramural Program for the Peabody Demonstration School Boys." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1937.

Welch, Betty Jo. "A Report on the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963.

Wells, Aileen. "Educational Occupations and Specific Training of Certain Peabody Graduating Classes." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1928.

White, Norman D. "The Status and Potential of College Controlled Laboratory Schools." Peabody Contribution to Education: second series, Number 251. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1964.

Williams, Henry Adolphus, Jr. "Faculty Benefits." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1957.

Williams, Virginia A. "A Study of Student Teaching in Business Education in Seven Selected Colleges in Tennessee." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1955.

Wing, Fred Edward. "A Report on the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College Freshman English, 1961-1962." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1962.

Worthy, Opal Miller. "An Analytical Survey of the Master's Theses in the English Departments at Peabody College." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1934.

Wurster, Robert J. "A Report on the Training Program for the Preparation of Teachers of College English." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1961.

Yong, Kai Cheong. "Audio-Visual Education in Private Teacher Training Institutions of the Nine Southeastern States." Unpublished Specialist in Education independent study, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1966.

Zimmerman, J. W. "The Junior High School Training Schools of the Teachers Colleges." Unpublished Master's thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1925.

APPENDIX E

LIST OF TRUSTEES, 1937-1945

	'37	'38	'39	'40	'41	'42	'43	'44	'45
Andrews, Forrest			x	x	x	x	x	x	ed
Barton, T. H.						x	x	x	x
Birdwell, A. W.			x	x	x	x	x	x	x
+Browning, Gordon	x	x							
Caldwell, James E.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Caldwell, William A.	x	x	x						
Cheek, John H.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Cheek, Newman A.				s	s	s	s	s	s
Clements, C. R.				x	x	x	x	v	v
+Cooper, Prentice			x	x	x	x	x	x	
Couch, Harvey C.	x	x	x	x	x				
Craig, C. A.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Donavan, Herman Lee			x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Evans, Silliman				x	x	x	x	x	x
Farris, Frank M.				x	f	f	f	f	f
+Garrison, S. C.				x	x	x	x	x	
Gillette, Frank E.				x	x	x	x	x	x

	'37	'38	'39	'40	'41	'42	'43	'44	'45
Hays, Brooks				x	x	x	x	x	x
Hill, H. G.	ex	ex	ex	ex	ex	c	c-		
Hill, H. G., Jr.								x	x
Hill, James Brent	x	x	x	f	x	x	x	x	x
Hume, Walter					x	x	x	x	x
Ivy, H. M.			x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Jackson, Granberry	t	t	t	x-					
James, George R.	x								
Jarman, J. F.	f	f	f-						
Jarman, W. Maxey				x	s	s	s	s	s
Jones, B. B.	v	v	v	v	v	x			
Jones, Jesse H.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Little, Charles R.	s	s	s	s					
Marston, Hunter S.	x								
Martin, Thomas W.	x								
Maxon, James M.						x	x	x	x
+McCord, James N.									x
Mikell, H. J.	c	c	c	c	c				
Morton, Ben A.	x	x	x	x	x	v	v	c	c
Nelson, Charles				t	t	t	t	t	t
Orr, Joseph K.	x	x	x-						
Palmer, E. W.				x	x	x	x	x	x

	'37	'38	'39	'40	'41	'42	'43	'44	'45
Pigford, C. E.				x	x	x	x	x	
Powell, W. F.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sensing, Thurman	at	at	at						
Stokes, Walter, Jr.				x	x	x	x	x	x
Tupper, Vernon S.	x	x	x	x	x	ex	ex	ex	ex
Warner, Edwin A.								x	x
Warren, James E.				x	x	x	x	x	x

Source: Bulletin, XXVI-XXXIV (1937-45).

c = Chairman of the Board
v = Vice-Chairman
t = Treasurer
at = Assistant Treasurer
s = Secretary
ex = Executive Committee Chairman
f = Finance Committee Chairman
ed = Education Committee Chairman
x = Member of the Board
+ = Ex officio member
- = Deceased

APPENDIX F

STATEMENT OF INCOME, 1937-1945

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1937

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Correspondence Study		$ 9,225.65
Diploma Fees		9,306.80
Extension Department		5,491.66
Petty Receipts		747.69
Tuitions		221,440.61
Endowment Investments		198,164.14
Gifts and Grants		
For Library Ventilation		2,100.00
For Library Books		75.00
Library		
Student Fines and Miscellaneous Sales		618.45
Total Educational and General		$447,170.00
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Caps and Gowns		1,542.00
Dormitory Room Rents		67,493.00
Garage Rents		284.00
Infirmary		691.00
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Actitities		$ 70,010.50
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Funds Investments		
Bond Interest		1,664.16
Minor Property		704.33
Sulgrave Property		10,424.15
Total Other Non-Educational Income		$ 12,792.64
Total Budgeted Income		$529,973.14
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships - Investments	$2,120.04	
Gifts	4,194.00	6,314.04
Bookstore		27,275.65
Cafeteria		56,867.04
Knapp Farm		16,874.30
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$107,331.03
Total Current Income		$637,304.17

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR
ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1938

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Correspondence Study		$ 9,592.97
Diploma Fees		10,355.00
Extension Department		4,172.97
Petty Receipts		875.00
Tuitions		270,464.81
Endowment Investments		
Unrestricted		183,533.07
Gifts and Grants		
For Library Expense		100.00
For Survey and Field Studies		10,402.00
Library		
Student Fines, etc.		867.88
Total Educational and General		$490,363.70
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Caps and Gowns		1,604.15
Dormitory Room Rents		71,142.41
Garage Rents		346.25
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities		$ 73,092.81
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Funds Investments		
Sulgrave Property		$ 10,583.34
Total Budgeted Income		$574,039.85
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships		
Investments	$5,268.22	
Gifts	1,956.30	7,224.52
Bookstore		29,890.14
Cafeteria		54,060.18
Knapp Farm		14,176.82
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$105,351.66
Total Current Income		$679,391.51

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1939

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
Student Fees	
Caps and Gowns	$ 2,269.00
Correspondence Study	12,239.34
Graduation	12,655.00
Infirmary	877.66
Petty Receipts	869.70
Tuitions--1939	305,219.47
Tuitions--Previous to 1939	17,898.94
Endowment Investments--Unrestricted	187,449.04
Gifts and Grants	
Survey Fund	2,355.67
Total Educational and General	$541,843.82
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Dormitories	$ 74,175.83
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME	
Annuity Fund Investments	
Sulgrave Property	$ 11,100.82
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL	
Tuitions	$ 45,501.80
Total Budgeted Income	$672,622.27
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Bookstore	33,078.09
Cafeteria	49,171.03
Knapp Farm	16,898.40
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$ 99,147.52
Total Current Income	$771,769.79

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1940

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Caps and Gowns		$ 2,438.50
Correspondence Study		10,705.13
Diploma Fees		13,611.50
Infirmary		848.50
Petty Receipts		970.96
Tuitions-prior to Jan. 1, 1940		16,678.52
Tuitions-1940		342,984.94
Endowment Investments-Unrestricted		174,810.43
Miscellaneous Donations		921.04
Library-Student Fines		653.00
Total Educational and General		$564,622.52
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Dormitory Room Rents		77,406.56
Garage Rents		108.55
Mimeographing		63.18
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities		$ 77,578.29
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Fund Investments		
Sulgrave Property		$ 10,075.00
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL		
Bookstore		383.82
Interest		80.00
Tuitions-Nursery School	$ 1,372.33	
Sundry	39,995.22	41,367.55
Total Demonstration School		$ 41,831.37
Total Budgeted Income		$694,107.18
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships-Investments	$ 4,977.06	
Gifts	1,353.00	6,330.06
Bookstore		33,046.71
Cafeteria		44,776.21
Knapp Farm		11,888.54
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$ 96,041.52
Total Current Income		$790,148.70

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1941

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Caps and Gowns		$ 2,191.87
Correspondence Study		9,392.56
Diploma Fees		12,135.00
Infirmary		741.50
Petty Receipts		1,009.12
Private Lessons		361.00
Tuitions-prior to Jan. 1, 1941		15,471.96
Tuitions		328,186.88
Endowment Investments-Unrestricted		179,662.29
Library-Student Fines		681.50
Total Educational and General		$549,833.68
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Dormitory Room Rents		73,655.09
Garage Rents		66.30
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities		$ 73,721.39
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Fund Investments		
Sulgrave Property		$ 10,525.00
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL		
Bookstore		514.26
Interest		72.08
Tuitions-Nursery School	$ 1,676.50	
Sundry	45,105.33	46,781.83
Total Demonstration School		$ 47,368.17
Total Budgeted Income		$681,448.24
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships-Investments	$ 5,891.66	
Gifts	1,177.00	7,068.66
Bookstore		30,872.56
Cafeteria		49,910.21
Knapp Farm		16,076.94
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$103,928.37
Total Current Income		$785,376.61

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1942

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Caps and Gowns		$ 1,751.00
Correspondence Study		6,946.27
Diploma Fees		10,400.10
Infirmary		386.50
Petty Receipts		1,091.68
Private Lessons		553.34
Tuitions-prior to Jan. 1, 1942		12,765.66
Tuitions		251,821.88
Endowment Investments-Unrestricted		182,702.87
Total Educational and General		$468,419.30
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Dormitory Room Rents		66,175.07
Garage Rents		189.75
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities		$ 66,364.82
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Fund Investments		
Sulgrave Property		$ 10,483.00
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL		
Bookstore-Net		446.01
Interest		.04
Tuitions-Nursery School	$ 5,598.75	
Sundry	46,986.19	52,584.94
Total Demonstration School		$ 53,030.99
Total Budgeted Income		$598,298.11
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships-Investments	$ 6,136.45	
Gifts	2,179.00	8,315.45
Bookstore		26,769.79
Cafeteria		54,158.64
Knapp Farm		11,992.57
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$101,236.45
Total Current Income		$699,534.56

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1943

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Caps and Gowns		$ 1,164.50
Correspondence Study		7,024.85
Diploma Fees		7,390.00
Infirmary		352.20
Petty Receipts		956.76
Private Lessons		682.35
Tuitions prior to Jan. 1, 1943		10,621.39
Tuitions--1943		199,181.61
Endowment Investments--Unrestricted		172,571.45
Total Educational and General		$399,945.11
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Dormitory Room Rents		$ 61,128.19
Garage Rents		127.15
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities		$ 61,255.34
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Fund Investments		
Sulgrave Property		$ 11,234.00
GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE-U.S. ARMY		$ 8,722.53
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL		
Bookstore-Net		537.11
Interest		90.10
Tuitions-Preschool	$ 6,331.23	
Sundry	58,499.71	64,830.94
Total Demonstration School		$ 65,458.15
Total Budgeted Income		$546,615.13
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships-Investments	$ 4,616.81	
Gifts	2,950.00	7,566.81
Bookstore		34,005.38
Cafeteria		13,049.17
Knapp Farm		22,383.81
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$ 77,005.17
Total Current Income		$623,620.30

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR
ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1944

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Caps and Gowns		$ 827.00
Correspondence Study		8,951.80
Diploma Fees		5,381.00
Infirmary		642.83
Petty Receipts		1,566.82
Private Lessons		1,292.40
Tuitions prior to Jan. 1, 1944		13,600.90
Tuitions		227,106.67
Endowment Investments-Unrestricted		180,233.31
Total Educational and General		$439,602.73
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Dormitory Room Rents		40,900.97
Garage Rents		114.50
Total Auxiliary Enterprises		$ 41,015.47
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Fund Investments		
Sulgrave Property		10,758.00
Survey and Field Grant		
General Education Board		6,900.00
Total Other Non-Educational Income		17,658.00
Total Budgeted Income		$498,276.20
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships-Investments	$7,728.47	
Gifts	2,216.67	9,945.14
Book Store		36,830.21
Cafeteria		36,801.88
Peabody Demonstration School		80,221.81
General Administration-Army		5,661.50
Knapp Farm		23,609.93
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$193,070.47
Total Current Income		$691,346.67

CURRENT INCOME FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1945

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL		
Student Fees		
Caps and Gowns		$ 1,164.50
Correspondence Study		7,024.85
Diploma Fees		7,390.00
Infirmary		352.20
Petty Receipts		956.76
Private Lessons		682.35
Tuitions prior to Jan. 1, 1945		10,621.39
Tuitions--1945		199,181.61
Endowment Investments-Unrestricted		172,471.45
Total Educational and General		$399,945.11
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES		
Dormitory Room Rents		61,128.19
Garage Rents		127.15
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities		$ 61,255.34
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL INCOME		
Annuity Fund Investments		
Sulgrave Property		$ 11,234.00
GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE-U.S. ARMY		$ 8,722.53
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL		
Bookstore-Net		537.11
Interest		90.10
Tuitions-Preschool	$ 6,331.23	
Sundry	48,499.71	64,830.94
Total Demonstration School		$ 65,458.15
Total Budgeted Income		$546,615.13
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE: NON-BUDGET		
Scholarships-Investments	$ 4,616.81	
Gifts	2,950.00	7,566.81
Bookstore		34,005.38
Cafeteria		13,049.17
Knapp Farm		22,383.81
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget		$ 77,005.17
Total Current Income		$623,620.30

APPENDIX G

STATEMENT OF EXPENSE, 1937-1945

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1937

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administration Expense	
Administration Office Salaries	$ 30,675.32
Business Office Salaries	11,872.31
Board of Trustees	630.70
General Expense	58,283.30
Instruction	
Faculty Salaries	221,098.64
Sundry Laboratories	11,153.41
Organized Research	20,498.04
Extension	
Correspondence Study	6,914.52
Extension Department	4,818.14
Libraries	26,945.00
Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant	46,548.84
Total Educational and General	$439,438.22
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Caps and Gowns	37.04
Dormitory Maintenance and Expense	24,238.39
Eighteenth and Nineteenth Avenue Property	8,944.04
Infirmary Expense	4,666.90
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities	$ 37,886.37
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest and Expense	22,323.36
Financial Campaign	4,589.77
Total Other Non-Educational Expense	$ 26,913.13
Total Budgeted Income	$504,237.72
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	7,049.03
Bookstore	26,478.02
Cafeteria	53,321.53
Knapp Farm	14,345.98
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$101,194.56
Total Current Expense	$605,432.28

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1938

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administration and Expense	
Administrative Office Salaries	$ 23,373.87
Business Office Salaries	10,815.83
Board of Trustees	591.85
General Expense	45,265.98
Instruction	
Faculty Salaries	243,602.72
Educational Office Supplies and Expense	3,313.49
Faculty Annuities	5,654.38
Sundry Laboratories	12,348.80
Organized Research	
Surveys and Field Studies	19,250.64
Extension	
Correspondence Study	7,286.11
Extension Department	1,971.06
Libraries	30,230.00
Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant	
Physical Plant	43,056.46
Other General Services	2,936.09
Total Educational and General	$449,697.28
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Dormitory Maintenance and Expense	21,889.53
18th and 19th Avenue Property	8,852.37
Infirmary - Net	6,654.84
Total Auxiliary Enterprises and Activities	$ 37,396.74
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest	2,920.00
Annuity Sulgrave Property	10,986.25
Total Non-Educational Expense	$ 13,906.25
Total Budgeted Expense	$501,000.27
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES-NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	7,081.73
Bookstore	26,534.43
Cafeteria	51,394.51
Knapp Farm	12,915.02
Total Auxiliary Enterprises--Non-Budget	$ 97,925.69
Total Current Expense	$598,925.96

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1939

1.	General		
	Administrative Offices	$ 32,095.83	
	General Expense	46,505.78	
			$ 78,601.61
2.	Educational		
	Instruction	279,755.23	
	Organized Research	10,971.89	
	Correspondence Study	8,430.11	
	Libraries	34,077.67	
	Peabody Demonstration School	61,447.98	
			394,682.88
3.	Operation of Plant		
	Dormitories	28,731.38	
	School Plant	58,866.06	
	Sulgrave and Annuities	16,419.56	
			104,017.00
			577,301.49
4.	Other Expense		
	Scholarship	6,332.71	
	Bookstore	29,504.58	
	Cafeteria	49,154.68	
	Knapp Farm	12,633.19	
			97,625.16
	Total		$674,926.65

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1940

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administrative and Expense	$ 32,456.30
General Expense	71,669.60
Instruction	292,995.92
Organized Research	
Surveys and Field Studies	11,357.00
Extension	
Correspondence Study	8,271.63
Libraries	
Joint University Libraries	
Books and Periodicals	12,379.12
Salaries and Expenses	24,521.31
Physical Plant and Other General Services	
Operation and Maintenance	50,067.70
Other General Services	7,348.86
	$511,068.24
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Operation and Maintenance of Dormitories	$ 40,130.25
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest	2,920.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments	6,000.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments Maintenance	6,650.61
Total Other Non-Educational Expenses	$ 15,570.61
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL	
General Control	7,119.70
Industrial Services	55,251.88
Operation of Plant	2,505.53
Auxiliary Agencies	3,984.85
Total Demonstration School	$ 68,861.96
Total Budgeted Expense	$635,631.06
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	6,382.09
Bookstore	29,226.34
Cafeteria	47,197.69
Knapp Farm	10,974.53
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$ 93,780.65
Total Current Expenses	$729,411.71

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR
ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1941

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administrative and Expense	
General Administrative Offices	$ 32,066.12
General Administrative	88,709.64
Instruction	302,638.71
Organized Research	
Surveys and Field Studies	10,446.54
Extension	
Correspondence Study	7,163.99
Libraries	
Joint University Libraries	
Books and Periodicals	9,598.55
Salaries and Expenses	24,783.60
Physical Plant and Other General Services	
Operation and Maintenance	47,715.36
Other General Services	5,335.42
Total Educational and General	$528,457.93
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Operation and Maintenance of Dormitories	$ 35,718.76
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest	2,080.00
Annuity-Mrs. Payne	1,853.16
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments	6,000.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments-Maintenance	7,497.48
Total Other Non-Educational Expense	$ 17,430.64
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL	
General Control	7,041.66
Industrial Services	54,397.61
Operation of Plant	2,606.42
Auxiliary Agencies	3,806.64
Total Demonstration School	$ 67,852.33
Total Budgeted Expense	$649,459.66
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	6,532.29
Bookstore	28,346.62
Cafeteria	50,555.28
Knapp Farm	12,400.46
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$ 97,834.65
Total Current Expense	$747,294.31

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1942

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administrative and Expense	
General Administrative Offices	$ 30,116.84
General Administrative	44,353.04
Instruction	281,309.92
Organized Research	
Surveys and Field Studies	8,764.68
Extension	
Correspondence Study	5,575.41
Libraries	
Joint University Libraries	26,221.09
Physical Plant and General Services	
Operation and Maintenance	53,644.59
Other General Services	5,427.23
Total Educational and General	$455,412.80
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Operation and Maintenance of Dormitories	$ 41,270.83
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest	1,520.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apts.	6,000.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apts.-Maintenance	6,312.16
Total Other Non-Educational Expense	$ 13,832.16
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL	
General Control	6,791.79
Instructional Services	55,550.00
Operation of Plant	3,049.41
Auxiliary Agencies	5,068.56
Total Demonstation School	$ 70,459.76
Total Budgeted Expense	$580,975.55
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	6,421.74
Bookstore	24,805.31
Cafeteria	53,236.75
Knapp Farm	12,834.46
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$ 97,298.26
Total Current Expense	$678,273.81

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1943

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administrative and Expense	
General Administrative Offices	$ 22,902.34
General Administrative	38,406.30
Instruction	211,689.56
Organized Research	
Surveys and Field Studies	11,333.60
Extension	
Correspondence Study	5,436.01
Libraries	
Joint University Libraries	31,874.24
Physical Plant and General Services	
Operation and Maintenance	44,288.06
Other General Services	5,114.67
Total Educational and General	$371,044.78
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Operation and Maintenance of Dormitories	$ 31,385.92
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest	1,442.50
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments	6,000.00
Sulgrave Apartments-Maintenance	5,937.86
Total Other Non-Educational Expense	$13,380.36
PEABODY DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL	
General Control	7,072.83
Instructional Services	52,629.12
Operation of Plant	3,231.76
Auxiliary Agencies	4,771.46
Total Demonstration School	$ 67,705.17
Total Budgeted Expense	$483,516.23
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	6,401.96
Bookstore	29,805.15
Cafeteria	13,804.89
Knapp Farm	19,134.73
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$ 69,146.73
Total Current Expenses	$552,662.96

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR
ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1944

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administrative and Expense	
General Administrative Offices	$ 30,068.23
General Administrative	45,819.02
Instruction	220,081.12
Organized Research	
Survey and Field Studies	16,947.91
Extension	
Correspondence Study	6,091.76
Libraries	
Joint University Libraries	33,663.15
Physical Plant and General Services	
Operation and Maintenance	48,657.14
Other General Services	5,360.72
Total Educational and General	$406,689.05
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Operation and Maintenance of Dormitories	$ 28,746.53
OTHER NON EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE	
Annuity Interest	1,285.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments	6,000.00
Sulgrave Apartments-Maintenance	5,618.55
Total Other Non-Educational Expense	$ 12,903.55
Total Budgeted Expense	$448,339.13
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	7,439.51
Book Store	33,917.85
Cafeteria	32,915.74
Peabody Demonstration School	78,118.75
Knapp Farm	15,858.78
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$168,250.63
Total Current Expenses	$616,589.76

CURRENT EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1945

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL	
General Administrative and Expense	
General Administrative Offices	$ 30,524.88
General Administrative	52,906.90
Instruction	270,890.46
Organized Research	24,530.16
Extension	
Correspondence Study	6,915.14
Libraries	
Joint University Libraries	28,296.48
Physical Plant and General Services	
Operation and Maintenance	70,269.07
Other General Services	515.18
Total Educational and General	$484,884.27
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND ACTIVITIES	
Operation and Maintenance of Dormitories	$ 41,874.89
OTHER NON-EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES	
Annuity Interest	1,285.00
Annuity-Sulgrave Apartments	6,000.00
Sulgrave Apartments Maintenance	6,360.00
Total Other Non-Educational Expense	$ 13,645.30
Total Budgeted Expense	$540,404.46
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES: NON-BUDGET	
Scholarships	10,450.73
Bookstore	37,061.56
Cafeteria	71,848.76
Demonstration School	85,812.52
Knapp Farm	19,457.84
Total Auxiliary Enterprises: Non-Budget	$224,631.41
Total Current Expenses	$765,035.87

APPENDIX H

GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD GRANTS TO GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, 1909-1945

APPENDIX H

GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD GRANTS TO GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, 1909-1945

Date	Amount	Purpose
8-11-09	$150,000	Vanderbilt-Peabody study of affiliation
5-24-12	250,000	Seaman A. Knapp School of Country Life
10-26-16	200,000	Endowment
4-26-20	30,000	For each of five years for increasing teachers' salaries
6-15-21	200,000	Construction of a dormitory
6-6-23	400,000	Demonstration School Building
	200,000	Men's dormitory
2-28-24	200,000	Demonstration Building
10-7-24	150,000	Construction of Administration Building
5-28-25	30,000	Current expenses
2-25-26	400,000	Endowment
	30,000	For salaries and new staff (for each of two years) (Lapsed: $19,164.40)
11-28-26	500,000	Endowment
	12,000	Current expenses (Lapsed: $604.17)

Date	Amount	Purpose
2-18-27	$200,000	Endowment
11-19-28	3,500	Dr. Hall, Professor of Secondary Education
12-12-28	245,000	Establishment of the Division of Surveys and Field Studies (Lapsed: $60,909.99)
	9,250	Dr. Frank Bachman, Director of the Division of Surveys and Field Studies
12-20-29	3,500	Dr. Charles Knudsen, Professor of Secondary Education
5-22-30	75,000	School of Library Science
	5,000	Equipment, School of Library Science
6-2-30	10,000	Survey of the Nashville school system
3-27-31	1,800	Conference of directors and draftsmen
5-9-32	3,500	Dr. Norman Frost, Professor of Rural Education
10-14-32	7,500	Dual Education Department
12-13-32	7,500	Problems of dual education
3-17-33	20,000	School of Library Science
12-14-33	18,000	School of Library Science
12-13-34	300,000	Division of Surveys and Field Studies
12-15-35	32,000	School of Library Science
10-16-36	1,800	Grace Sobotka, study of art education
3-19-37	10,000	School of Library Science

Date	Amount	Purpose
5-21-37	$ 4,450	Grant-in-Aid: training in curriculum revision
12-2-37	100,000	School of Library Science
5-20-38	2,500	Grant-in-Aid: problems in teacher training
	2,150	Grant-in-Aid: training in curriculum revision
	3,750	Study by Fred McCuistion
1-20-39	1,625	Grant-in-Aid: Fred McCuistion
5-19-39	4,000	Grant-in-Aid: training rural elementary teachers
10-20-39	500	Grant-in-Aid: publishing of McCuistion study findings
12-7-39	12,000	American Council on Education for study of school equipment (Lapsed: $8,671.98)
6-14-40	2,500	Seminar on teacher education
11-15-40	21,000	Professor of Library Education and Professor of Home Economics
6-20-41	2,500	Seminar on teacher education
10-17-41	1,800	Grant-in-Aid: Eugene M. Boyce
	600	A. C. Lewis, Consultant
11-14-41	15,000	American Council on Education for study of school equipment
4-2-42	250,000	Division of Surveys and Field Studies
5-15-42	3,000	Workshop in community education

Date	Amount	Purpose
5-15-42	$ 1,500	For leaders in Oklahoma State Curriculum Revision Program to attend program sponsored by Division of Surveys and Field Studies
10-16-42	6,000	Grant-in-Aid: employment of Ina C. Brown as Visiting Professor of Social Anthropology
5-21-43	3,000	Workshop on community leadership
9-24-43	7,500	Grant-in-Aid: study by Southern Rural Life Council on problems of rural education
10-22-43	6,200	Grant-in-Aid: case study of community schools in the South
3-10-44	2,500	Workshop in teacher education
5-19-44	2,000	Workshops for teacher trainers
6-16-44	22,300	Southern Rural Life Council
10-27-44	5,000	Grant-in-Aid: Interstate School Building Service
4-5-45	24,700	Support of regional materials service
5-18-45	6,500	Grant-in-Aid: Child Study Clinic
	2,500	Workshop in teacher education
	1,500	Workshop on community school plant facilities
	1,500	Workshop for training rural teachers
Total	$4,225,425	